United Nations A/66/66-E/2011/78

General Assembly
Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
7 February 2011

Original: English

General Assembly
Sixty-sixth session

Groups of countries in special situations: Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries

Economic and Social Council
Substantive session of 2011
Geneva, 4-29 July 2011

Implementation of and follow-up to major international United Nations conferences and summits: review and coordination of the implementation of the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2001-2010

Ten-year appraisal and review of the implementation of the Brussels Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2001-2010

Report of the Secretary-General

Summary

The present report is submitted in compliance with General Assembly resolution 65/171 and Economic and Social Council resolution 2010/27, in which the Secretary-General was requested to submit a 10-year comprehensive report on the implementation of the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2001-2010 to the Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, identifying, inter alia, lessons learned and best practices, as well as structural constraints and handicaps encountered, resource requirements and resource gaps in achieving the set objectives of the Programme of Action. In accordance with General Assembly resolution 63/227, this comprehensive appraisal should also identify actions and initiatives needed to overcome persisting obstacles and identify effective international and domestic policies in the light of the outcome of the appraisal.

11-22699 (E) 110311

Please recycle

I. Introduction

1. The Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries adopted by the Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries[1] in Brussels on 20 May 2001 provides a self-contained comprehensive framework for the sustainable development of least developed countries leading to improvements in the everyday lives of millions in least developed countries and a radical transformation of the economic and social structure of these countries. It followed two previous decade-long Programmes of Action for the Least Developed Countries agreed at the first and second United Nations Conferences for the Least Developed Countries, held in Paris in 1981 and 1991. The group of least developed countries is identified on the basis of the analysis done by the Committee on Development Policy.[2]

2. The present report contributes to the global review of the implementation of the Brussels Programme of Action, building on national and regional reviews. It is organized as follows. Section II provides a brief overview of the structure and objectives of the Programme of Action. Section III describes progress in the implementation of the Programme of Action, including the attainment of its goals and targets as well as their linkage to the implementation of related actions.

3. On the basis of this analysis, section IV presents lessons learned with respect to the focus of the Brussels Programme of Action, its mainstreaming in development plans of least developed countries and aid strategies and cooperation policies of donors, the effectiveness of international support measures, conduciveness of the international environment and adequacy of the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms. The report concludes with recommendations for a new programme of action.[3]

II. Structure and objectives of the Brussels Programme of Action

4. The ultimate objective of the Brussels Programme of Action is graduation of least developed countries from this status. Its overarching goal is to make substantial progress towards halving the proportion of people living in extreme poverty and suffering from hunger by 2015 and promote sustainable development of

[1] A/CONF.191/13, chap. II.

[2] There are three criteria for inclusion in the group of least developed countries: (i) low-income, based on a three-year average estimate of the gross national income of $905 per capita; (ii) a human assets index based on indicators of nutrition, health, education and adult literacy; and (iii) an economic vulnerability index based on indicators of population size, remoteness, export concentration, share of agriculture, forestry and fisheries in gross domestic product, homelessness owing to natural disasters, instability of agricultural production, and instability of exports of goods and services.

[3] The present report is based on previous analyses of the implementation of the Brussels Programme of Action, reports of the Secretary-General from 2003 to 2010, the national and regional reports (A/CONF.219/IPC/3 and A/CONF.219/IPC/4), United Nations Conference on Trade and Development least developed country reports and analytical work by the Committee on Development Policy. It also draws on assessments made during the preparatory process for the Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, especially the thematic pre-conference events.

the least developed countries. Significant and steady increases in gross domestic product (GDP) growth rates, and increasing investment were seen as the main requirements for reaching the overarching goal (see A/CONF.191/13, chap. II, para. 6). The Programme of Action endorsed a "new development paradigm where economic growth and development are prerequisites for the eradication of poverty" (see A/CONF.191/13, chap. II, para. 13).

5. The Brussels Programme of Action is constructed around seven commitments: (i) fostering a people-centred policy framework; (ii) good governance at national and international levels; (iii) building human and institutional capacities; (iv) building productive capacities to make globalization work for least developed countries; (v) enhancing the role of trade in development; (vi) reducing vulnerability and protecting the environment; and (vii) mobilizing financial resources. A short description of issues and actions by least developed countries and development partners are listed under each commitment. In contrast to earlier programmes of action, most commitments also have specific goals and targets, with the exception of commitments 2, 5 and 6. This holistic approach and the specific responsibilities embraced by least developed countries and their development partners set the Brussels Programme of Action apart from other internationally agreed initiatives and programmes.

6. The Brussels Programme of Action also recognizes the following cross-cutting priority issues: poverty eradication; gender equality; employment; governance at national and international levels; capacity-building; sustainable development; special problems of landlocked and small island least developed countries; and challenges faced by least developed countries affected by conflict. However, some of these cross-cutting issues, especially employment and conflict-related issues, are not reflected in the explicit goals and targets.

7. The Brussels Programme of Action is based on the principle of common benefits and common and differentiated responsibilities between least developed countries and development partners. Furthermore, it is guided by the following five principles: (i) an integrated approach in which the development process should be viewed in a comprehensive, coherent and long-term manner; (ii) genuine partnership with greater alignment between national policies and strategies in least developed countries and the external assistance strategies of their partners; (iii) country ownership, where least developed countries should identify national priorities that their development partners can use to provide support; (iv) the principle of market considerations with an appropriate mix of public/private participation and due attention to market weaknesses; and (v) result orientation through the process of identifying, assessing and monitoring progress on processes and concrete outcomes.

8. The Brussels Programme of Action reflects the strong influence of two major events that preceded it, namely the conclusion of the Uruguay Round of multilateral trade negotiations and the adoption of the United Nations Millennium Declaration.[4] Its strongest emphases are on beneficial integration into the globalization process and improving the daily lives of individuals. "A balance between economic and other objectives" (see A/CONF.191/13, chap. II, para. 21 (a)) is an essential element of its integrated approach.

[4] See resolution 55/2.

9. The main premise of the Brussels Programme of Action is that poverty reduction, growth and sustainable development require investments in both physical and human capital, as well as structural transformation in least developed countries. Given the low level of domestic savings, official development assistance (ODA), foreign direct investment and other transfers could close the savings and the foreign exchange gaps. The Programme of Action expects exports to be the principal driver of development of least developed countries. Commitment 5 indicates how to overcome constraints and transform trade into a powerful engine for growth and poverty eradication. Trade volumes and earnings from trade should increase and small producers should obtain larger benefits. Diversification from low value-added to high value-added products and the processing of primary commodities are important goals.

10. Many of the actions to be implemented by least developed countries aim to establish an environment in which development policies will be effective. Enabling the domestic and international environments in particular would generate increased investments and facilitate a structural transformation of production and exports, leading to the attainment of the principal objectives of the Programme of Action.

11. According to the Brussels Programme of Action, the major responsibility of development partners is to provide special support measures for least developed countries in order to support their own efforts to achieve the overall objectives. This includes financial and technical support geared to the particular needs of least developed countries. Apart from Governments of least developed countries and of development partners, the private sector and civil society are also crucial actors in the implementation of the Programme of Action. Market weaknesses in least developed countries are recognized, but reliance on markets remains strong. States are responsible for making the market economy function through institutional and regulatory reforms and good governance. Enterprises are responsible for corporate good governance.

12. The following review of progress in the implementation of the Brussels Programme of Action during the past decade is not structured by commitment,[5] but rather by groups' "actions" and "goals" thematically. This is owing to the fact that similar actions with similar objectives appear under different commitments, as specific commitments and actions are often interconnected. For example, actions to promote investment are mentioned under commitments 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7. Some of these themes also emanate from the explicit cross-cutting issues of the Programme of Action. The purpose of this appraisal is to provide an analytical assessment of the implementation of objectives, goals and targets, as well as actions and development processes, covering the areas of development cooperation, trade, foreign direct investment and debt reduction; the appraisal seeks to assess how adequate the proposed measures were and how effective their implementation was.

[5] See A/65/80-E/2010/77 and A/64/80-E/2009/79.

III. Progress with respect to main objectives of the Brussels Programme of Action

A. Economic development

1. Growth performance

13. The Brussels Programme of Action aims to achieve sustainable growth in least developed countries, in addition to increasing its pace, through macroeconomic stability and economic diversification. Expansion of domestic markets, to reduce dependence on exports, is also one of the priorities of the Programme of Action (see A/CONF.191/13, chap. II, para. 7 (c)). In addition, according to commitment 1, least developed countries will promote equitable distribution of the benefits of growth and development and improve access of the poor to basic services (see A/CONF.191/13, chap. II, para. 24 (c)). This will help expand domestic markets.

14. For the least developed countries as a group, the period since the adoption of the Brussels Programme of Action was marked by a particularly strong growth acceleration. During the eriod 2002-2007, their GDP surpassed the 7 per cent growth target set by the Programme of Action, up from less than 4 per cent during the previous decade. The majority of the 10 fastest growing least developed country economies were African least developed country exporters of oil and minerals, as a result of much improved terms of trade, owing essentially to the surge in primary commodity prices spurred by demand growth. Even in 2008, after the crisis struck, 11 least developed countries still exceeded the 7 per cen. arget. By contrast, 12 countries experienced growth below 3 per cent, showing that important differences in economic performance remain within the group.

15. The financial crisis and global recession of 2008 caused some decline in the overall growth rate of least developed countries, through limited financial contagion effects and, more strongly, the decline in international trade and the fall in foreign direct investment inflows and workers' remittances. The reduction in GDP growth was particularly sharp for small island least developed countries, for which tourism, one of the sectors most affected by the crisis, is very important. Asian manufactures exporters also experienced decline owing to reduced demand in main export markets, while the growth rate of African non-oil exporters actually increased in 2008. After 2008, the growth rate of least developed countries declined, but not as much as that of other country groups, thanks to macroeconomic stability and prudent macro policies implemented by least developed countries prior to the crisis.

16. Twenty-six least developed countries were considered as "fragile"[6] in 2004, defined in World Bank terms as countries with weak institutions and impacted by warfare, including all but one of the countries that grew less than 3 per cent per year during the period 2002-2007. Interestingly, eight out of nine countries with the fastest growing economies were "fragile", underscoring the vulnerability of good economic performance in the short to medium term when not supported by inclusive development policies and the building of productive capacities to increase economic resilience to shocks.

[6] The term "fragile States" is used by the World Bank for countries facing particularly severe development challenges: weak institutional capa :ity, poor governance, and political instability. Often these countries experience ongoing violence as the residue of past severe conflict.

17. Demographic dynamics also play an important role in the distribution of economic growth in addition to its quality and sustainability. Population growth reaching 2.7 per cent per year in least developed countries neutralized some of the rapid GDP growth and resulted in a GDP per capita growth rate that was around 4 per cent in the period 2002-2008. The average GDP per capita for the group increased only from $327 in 2000 to $467 in 2008.

2. Trade performance and progress towards economic diversification

18. During the boom period between 2000 and mid-2008, the total volume of exports from the least developed countries almost doubled, with African least developed countries leading this expansion. As a result of improved terms of trade, the purchasing power of least developed countries' exports almost tripled in that period, rising faster than the corresponding index for other developing countries. However, this improved trade performance happened only in a few least developed countries. Seven least developed countries (Angola, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Chad, Equatorial Guinea, Sudan and Yemen) alone accounted for 74 per cent of total least developed country exports in 2008, and oil exporting least developed countries alone accounted for 62 per cent of total least developed country exports. The value of their merchandise exports grew faster than imports[7] owing to increased prices and volumes allowing for the trade deficit of $4.5 billion in 2005 to be turned into a positive trade balance of $19 billion in 2008.

19. Least developed countries' total trade increased from slightly more than half of their GDP in the period 2000-2002 to about 70 per cent of GDP in the period 2006-2007, making them much more globalized and integrated with the world compared to the period prior to the Programme of Action, though still in a marginal manner. Their share of world exports rose from 0.56 per cent in 2003 to 1.07 per cent in 2008. The corresponding rise for imports was from 0.66 per cent to 0.94 per cent, in both cases as a result almost exclusively of the increase in the share of African least developed countries.

20. Contrary to the objectives and expectations of the Brussels Programme of Action, dependence on a few export products, particularly primary commodities, increased during the past decade. The Herfindahl-Hirschmann Index of export concentration of least developed countries increased from 0.23 in 1995 to 0.33 in 2000 and 0.54 in 2008. On average, three main export products of least developed countries account for three quarters of total exports, while in eight countries this proportion is higher than 95 per cent. The overall increase in export concentration has been essentially due to trends in African least developed countries, particularly the oil exporters among them. The share of agriculture in GDP has increased in 18 least developed countries, with an average share in GDP of 25 per cent, and it still provides the livelihood for a majority of least developed country populations. The share of manufacturing in GDP has been stagnant over the past 18 years at between 10 and 13 per cent, making it difficult to talk of a structural transformation in least developed countries. Compared to the previous decade, half of the least developed countries have experienced a deindustrialization process, measured by the declining share of manufactures in total output. Some progress in structural transformation has been recorded by Asian least developed countries, which has

[7] The value of least developed country exports increased from $36 billion in 2000 to $126 billion in 2009.

been driven by their specialization in low technology manufactures, primarily textiles.

21. The Brussels Programme of Action's stipulation for "improving preferential market access for least developed countries by working towards the objective of duty-free and quota-free market access for all least developed countries' products" (see A/CONF.191/13, chap. I, para. 6) is rather mild, but it has been strengthened by the call in the Ministerial Declaration of the Sixth Ministerial World Trade Organization Conference for duty-free and quota-free market access on a lasting basis for all products originating from all least developed countries by developed-country members, and developing-country members declaring themselves in a position to do so.[8] However, that is softened further in the text where it is stated that "Members facing difficulties at this time to provide market access ... shall provide duty-free and quota-free market access for at least 97 per cent of products originating from least developed countries, defined at the tariff line level"[9] instead of all products. A recent positive development is increasing duty-free and quota-free market access by emerging economies such as Brazil, China, India, Korea and Turkey.

22. Preferences enjoyed by least developed countries in their exports to developed countries have expanded over the 2001-2010 period, but preferential margins, for example, in textiles and clothing, have eroded as a result of overall tariff reductions and regional trade agreements. Comprehensive duty-free and quota-free market access would be particularly beneficial because least developed countries would enjoy bigger preferential margins in processed products into which they would like to diversify. These are usually products that are subject to tariff escalation and face higher most-favoured-nation or Generalized System of Preferences tariffs. However, exclusions from duty-free and quota-free access of some key products from some least developed countries in some schemes, especially those regarding products into which least developed countries would like to diversify, limit potential benefits.

23. The usefulness and impact of different duty-free and quota-free schemes can be assessed in several ways. From a coverage point of view, the Everything but Arms scheme of the European Union (EU) has 100 per cent coverage (except arms). Canada and Japan reach between 98 and 99 per cent. The coverage of the United States changes between 83 and 98 per cent, depending on whether a least developed country is covered under the African Growth and Opportunity Act or not. Rules of origin are usually complex and non-harmonized. Only the Everything but Arms scheme and, accordingly, Turkey's scheme are permanent programmes. Under the new EU Everything but Arms rules of origin, applicable as of 1 January 2011, least developed countries would benefit from additional relaxation in the application of rules of origin compared to non-least developed countries. For instance, in the case of textile and clothing, the origin rule is now single transformation for least developed countries while for all other beneficiaries it remains double transformation.

24. The Brussels Programme of Action calls for facilitation of the accession process of least developed countries to the World Trade Organization in order to benefit from the advantages of membership. However, only Cambodia and Nepal

[8] See WT/MIN(05)/DEC, annex F, para. 36 (a) (i).

[9] Ibid., para. 36 (a) (ii).

have acceded since 2000. They did obtain favourable treatment in some technically complex areas. The accession process of 12 other least developed countries is under way; for Sudan, it has been under way since 1994.[10] Efforts should be made to expedite and conclude the accession process of least developed countries, recognizing their trade, financial and development needs and capacities, while continuing to provide effective and adequate technical assistance.

25. Least developed countries are not asked to undertake binding commitments in the current multilateral trade negotiations. Their interests have been kept on the development agenda, but, without the conclusion of the Doha Development Agenda, the practical impact is impossible to assess. Although commitments have been made to grant duty-free and quota-free market access to least developed countries, to simplify and make transparent preferential rules of origin, to deal with cotton expeditiously, ambitiously and specifically, and to accord special priority to services sectors and service suppliers from least developed countries, these commitments have not been made fully operational. A development-oriented conclusion of the Doha Round remains an important step to improve trade-related support for the least developed countries. The Brussels Programme of Action was not concerned much with non-tariff barriers and market entry constraints that have emerged as the principal impediments to trade for least developed countries. These issues should be taken into account fully in the next programme of action.

3. Employment

26. Because of the nature of the high economic growth recorded by least developed countries in the 2000s, there was only a limited impact on employment creation and therefore on the rate of poverty reduction. While growth and increases in productivity should reduce unemployment and improve the quality of work and salaries, this only happened to a very limited extent in least developed countries owing to various market failures and other constraints.

27. In least developed countries agriculture continues to be the main source of employment, absorbing two thirds of the labour force. However, owing to population growth, more people are seeking work, and with urbanization, more people are seeking work outside agriculture, adding to underemployment in least developed countries. While the Brussels Programme of Action places great emphasis on rural development, efforts will also have to be devoted to creating urban jobs in the light of increasing the proportion of urban population and urban poverty in least developed countries. This is already recognized by the least developed countries themselves.

28. Because demand for manufactured goods (including processed food products) is more dynamic than for agricultural products, work opportunities in manufacturing become the key concern, given also the mismatch between the skills offered by workers and the skills needed by employers. In least developed countries, average labour productivity, measured by GDP per person employed, increased slowly, limiting possible salary increases. Between 1998 and 2009, it went up by almost 50 per cent in developing countries, but by only 44 per cent in least developed countries, and from a lower base. Thus the gap between the two increased. While

[10] Least developed countries in the accession process are: Afghanistan, Bhutan, Comoros, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Sudan, Vanuatu and Yemen.

the proportion of employed people living below $1.25 purchasing power parity ($PPP1.25) per day, that is "working poor", declined by about 45 per cent in developing countries as a whole, the decline was only 6.6 per cent in least developed countries.

29. The financial and economic crisis has had a significant impact on employment in least developed countries, particularly in export-oriented industries, mining and manufacturing. It has been estimated that the number of people living in extreme poverty was 7.3 million more than it would have been without the crisis in 2009. Similar difficulties were observed in several least developed countries where manufacturing factories were closed, continuing the trend of deindustrialization, especially in labour intensive sectors. Women were disproportionately affected by job losses in export processing zones and the tourism sector. As growing numbers of unemployed return to rural areas, agriculture provides a sort of informal safety net, with the negative consequence, however, of further lowering agricultural productivity, as, during a crisis, access to other agricultural inputs is unlikely to increase.

4. Regional integration and infrastructure development

30. In general, physical and economic infrastructure deficits, particularly in the financial, transport, and energy sectors, with the exception of information and communications technology (ICT), persisted. Prices remain high and coverage very low, especially in rural areas. Domestic and foreign investment in this sector has not been adequate to meet increasing demand. As a consequence, inadequate infrastructure slows economic growth and impedes human development efforts. In particular, improvements in physical infrastructure and transportation at the domestic and regional levels are particularly important in terms of making globalization work for least developed countries, improving access for the poor to essential services and achieving the Millennium Development Goals.

31. In 13 least developed countries the total road network increased but decreased in 5. Data availability for railways and air transport are very sketchy and no positive trends are observed. Thus, Governments and donors need to pay more attention to maintaining and expanding transport networks, including the connection of missing links and favouring multimodal transport infrastructure approaches, which are crucial for inter-regional and international trade expansion. Ports are a key element for international connectivity, but among the non-landlocked least developed countries container traffic is reported only for Bangladesh, the capacity of which doubled between 2001 and 2007.

32. Energy availability is crucial for improving productive capacities. The particularly strong "electricity divide" between the least developed countries and both developed and developing countries continues and is reflected in loss of competitiveness for industry in least developed countries. Most least developed countries, especially in Africa, experience frequent power outages. In 2006, globally there were 10 countries (for which data were available) where per capita consumption of electricity was less than 100 kWh. All of them were least developed countries. From 2000 to 2008, progress was recorded in least developed countries in the number of fixed telephone lines (from 0.5 to 1 per 100 persons) and Internet users (from 0.1 to 2.1 per 100 persons), while the number of mobile subscriptions increased spectacularly (from 0.3 to 20.9 per 100 persons). This is in line with

global trends, and private sector participation in mobile telephony has been a very important factor.

33. Regional integration processes including least developed countries have progressed well during the past decade, but more needs to be done to reap their multiplier effects. While Asian regionalism has focused on trade facilitation, regional agreements within African least developed countries have mostly lowered trade protection measures among members. More is needed to achieve deeper regional market integration and trade logistics efficiency at the subregional level. Enhanced regional cooperation in infrastructure, such as transport corridors and power pools, through harmonization of regulatory standards and pooling of resources can contribute a lot to the development efforts of least developed countries, which need to be supported at all levels.

B. Poverty, hunger and other targets related to the Millennium Development Goals

34. All actions included in the Brussels Programme of Action are ultimately geared towards reducing poverty and its principal manifestation, hunger. Unlike the reduction achieved by the developing countries as a group, progress in least developed countries has not been satisfactory. In terms of proportion to total population, the reduction is much slower than requested by the Programme of Action target — instead of a reduction by half, a reduction from 60.4 to 53.4 per cent was achieved. In developing countries, the reduction was from 33 to 26.6 per cent. Furthermore, three quarters of the least developed country population live below the $2-a-day poverty line.

35. According to the Brussels Programme of Action, hunger should be halved by 2015; however, in 2007, 32 per cent of the least developed country population was considered undernourished, while in developing countries the undernourished population rate was 16 per cent. These proportions were 40 per cent and 20 per cent, respectively, in the early 2000s. Many least developed countries are net food importers, which increases their vulnerability to food price increases, drops in export earnings and capital inflows. Nearly half of the least developed countries are considered by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations to be experiencing a food crisis and requiring external assistance or being at risk of crisis owing to high commodity prices, which are likely to remain higher and more volatile than in the past decade. The food price hikes in 2007 and 2008 worsened the food security situation in many least developed countries with already limited coping capacity. As agriculture was receiving inadequate prioritization and investment by both least developed countries and development partners, agricultural productivity in least developed countries is very low, a trend that needs to be reversed.

36. During the 2000s, least developed countries have made rapid progress in universal primary education and gender equality in school enrolment. The number of least developed countries with enrolment ratios less than 65 per cent fell from 16 in 2000 to 4 in 2008. However, only 59 per cent of children in least developed countries who start first grade reach the last grade of primary school, compared with 87 per cent in developing countries.

37. There are 29 least developed countries among the 43 developing countries participating in the Education for All Fast-track Initiative, a global compact on education, based on mutual accountability, comprising 33 bilateral, regional and international agencies and development banks, indicating that concerted and focused action contributed to the relative success in that area.

38. Both developing countries and least developed countries are off track in the rate of progress towards the target of reducing infant and child mortality by two thirds between 1990 and 2015. Infant mortality was reduced by 31 percentage points between 1990 and 2008, to an average of 82 per 1,000 infants. All of the 10 best absolute declines in under-five mortality rates are in least developed countries, but only one least developed country appears among the top 10 in proportional progress, demonstrating once again the difficulty of assessing success.

39. Better health for women is crucial for reaching the overall goals of the Brussels Programme of Action. The proportion of women receiving antenatal care during pregnancy from skilled health personnel is more than 85 per cent in 19 least developed countries and between 70 and 84 per cent in 15 least developed countries. These figures are generally increasing. However, in eight least developed countries less than half of the women receive antenatal care during pregnancy.

40. Progress in least developed countries has been mixed regarding access to safe water in rural areas, which increased from 50 per cent to 54 per cent between 2000 and 2008. Regarding access to improved sanitation facilities, both developing countries and least developed countries are off track, but the rate of progress in least developed countries is slower, with no significant acceleration since 2000. There is hardly any investment in water and sewage.

41. As there are important linkages between development, poverty reduction and gender equality, the Brussels Programme of Action stresses that gender equality and gender mainstreaming are essential strategic components for poverty reduction. In least developed countries, women work mostly in agriculture, comprising about half of the agricultural labour force. The proportion of women in better paying non-agricultural work is much lower. Some least developed country Governments have taken measures to reduce the earnings gap between men and women. In Nepal, where men earn about 45 per cent more than women, the 2005 labour and employment policy introduced gender-sensitive budgeting. There is a 25 per cent concession for women on land registration fees and a 10 per cent concession on income tax. Affirmative action seems necessary for progress in achieving gender equality in earnings.

42. There have been substantial increases in female literacy rates in almost all least developed countries, with an average increase from 44 per cent at the end of the 1990s to more than 50 per cent between 2005 and 2010. Gender differences in literacy rates generally declined, but on average they declined by only 3 per cent. However, in some countries with significant improvements in adult literacy, the gender gap widened, where resources must have been channelled disproportionately into male education. In some instances, girls in particular drop out of school to assist families affected by poverty, food shortages, armed conflict and HIV/AIDS.

43. Direct support to women entrepreneurs is seen as crucial for the economic empowerment of women. Many least developed countries have implemented relevant programmes, providing support through formal and informal means.

44. Overall progress towards reaching the human and social goals of the Brussels Programme of Action is visible yet still limited, and large imbalances persist within countries with respect to gender, rural/urban populations and other disadvantaged groups. Thus measures to improve social infrastructure and service delivery remain important for least developed countries. In order to achieve sustainable poverty reduction, there has to be a virtuous circle of social and human development interventions and outcomes and ones meant to enhance productive infrastructure and capacity and generate jobs on a sustainable basis.

C. Good governance

45. Commitment 2 focuses on actions by both least developed countries and development partners on good governance. The latter are called upon to assist the efforts of least developed countries, ensure transparency of development cooperation and support full and effective participation of least developed countries in international dialogue.

46. Least developed countries have accepted good governance as a necessity for development and the implementation of the Brussels Programme of Action. They have also made significant efforts to embed and institutionalize democratic governance in their own processes, although efforts and consequent outcomes have been uneven across the countries. Meaningful progress has been made in adopting democratic constitutions, ratifying international conventions, pursuing institutional reforms, drafting new legislation, increasing women representation in government, setting up legal frameworks against corruption, and starting decentralization processes and public sector reforms. For example, more than half of the African least developed countries have agreed to open themselves up to scrutiny as part of the New Partnership for Africa's Development Peer Review Mechanism.

47. Least developed countries can also claim considerable success in women's position in public life, one of the concerns of commitment 2 of the Programme of Action. In more than 17 least developed countries, women occupy more than 20 per cent of seats in the parliament. Rwanda is the only country in the world where more than half of the representatives are women; in Madagascar, Tuvalu, Solomon Islands and Yemen, however, there were none in 2010. Ethiopia has effective quotas for affirmative action for women in leadership and politics.

48. The Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) is a successful example of public/private initiative on good governance. Least developed country members of EITI include post-conflict countries such as Liberia and the Democratic Republic of the Congo, where it contributes to peace and reconciliation processes. Ten least developed countries have published reports concerning revenues from mining activities. The public can scrutinize this important government activity. In addition, 32 of 49 least developed countries are States parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption, and 6 are signatories.

49. However, there are also several shortcomings with respect to governance. For example, in most least developed countries the ratio of tax revenues to GDP has been very low, restricting policy space of governments and leading to aid dependency. Other critical deficits exist in the areas of citizen empowerment (particularly women and other marginalized groups) and human rights. In the World Bank governance indicators there seems to be relative decline for least developed

countries. In 2000, more least developed countries appeared in the top quartile and top half than in 2009, which indicates that, in general, improvements in least developed countries were not as good as they were in other countries. There is a need for building a capable developmental State through a better linkage between the democratic governance agenda and the development agenda, which should reinforce each other.

D. Mobilization of financial resources

50. Since the adoption of the Brussels Programme of Action, the least developed countries have made considerable efforts to mobilize domestic resources for their development so as to ensure the sustainability of funding for national development priorities. However, their domestic savings stagnated at around 13 per cent of GDP. Only the oil-producing countries experienced significant growth in domestic savings. By contrast, some post-conflict countries experienced negative savings rates. However, when domestic savings are adjusted for the cost of depleting stocks of fossil fuels, minerals and other forms of environmental capital, the net adjusted savings of the least developed countries reach close to zero in 2008. Thus, most least developed countries still face a huge financing gap, which is likely to have increased in 2009 on account of the current global financial and economic crisis.

51. Despite the fact that 17 least developed countries reached the Programme of Action target of 25 per cent of GDP as gross fixed capital formation, the average investment ratio increased slowly, from 18.7 per cent in 2000 to only 21.3 per cent in 2008, as compared to 29.3 per cent for all developing countries. This confirms the importance of addressing the weakness of domestic financial institutions and revising monetary policy to support investment-focused fiscal policy.

52. ODA continues to be the principal source of financing for the development of least developed countries and a conduit for productive capacity-building and infrastructure building and upgrading. As stressed in the Programme of Action, the large investment requirements of least developed countries imply a need for new and additional resources and efforts to increase ODA to least developed countries. ODA flows to least developed countries increased considerably in the period 2001-2010, but this was only to recuperate losses of the previous decade and reach levels similar to those of the 1990s. Moreover, these increases were comparable to the recovery observed in flows directed to non-least developed countries, suggesting that least developed country status does not necessarily imply a relatively greater amount of bilateral aid. In 2008, 25 per cent of bilateral ODA and 43 per cent of multilateral ODA went to least developed countries.

53. As for the achievement of the Brussels goals concerning the proportion of ODA to least developed countries in donors' gross national income (GNI), the aggregate ratio of ODA to GNI for Development Assistance Committee (DAC) members increased from 0.05 per cent in 1997-1998 to 0.09 per cent in 2008, thus remaining well below the lower 0.15 per cent target. In 2008, 9 out of 23 donors of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)/DAC met the 0.15 target (Luxembourg, followed by Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Ireland, Netherlands, Belgium, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Finland). The grant element of ODA to least developed countries is above 99 per cent in most cases.

54. The share of ODA received as per cent of GNI and the share of ODA in government expenditure have fallen for the least developed countries as a whole, except a slight increase for small island least developed countries. The net ODA/GNI ratio for the group declined from 10.5 per cent (1990-1999) to about 7.9 per cent in 2008. This decreasing trend remains most perceptible for the African least developed countries. There are large differences among countries. For example, those economies that moved into manufacturing and had faster growth have decreased their aid dependence, which accounts for only some 3 per cent of their GDP. Other least developed countries receive ODA for some 20 per cent of their GDP. The distribution of aid thus needs to take into account aspects of equity and need.

55. While the proportion of untied aid by DAC members was 87.3 per cent in 2008, there is some de facto tying of aid. Aid fragmentation and lack of donor coherence and coordination continue. Least developed countries in general, and especially small island countries among them, face the highest levels of volatility in ODA. Thus, stability and predictability of ODA flows need to be enhanced. Bilateral aid flows are generally procyclical with respect to business cycles in donor and recipient countries, unless recipient countries face large adverse shocks. Aid flows should be countercyclical to enable least developed countries to stabilize public expenditure.

56. An increasing share of aid goes to the social sectors instead of the productive sectors and economic infrastructure, mainly reflecting donors' approach to poverty reduction and partly in line with the Brussels Programme of Action itself, asking for determined efforts to increase ODA in support of efforts of least developed countries towards the provision of social infrastructure and social services. In the period 2006-2008 social infrastructure and services absorbed approximately 45 per cent of total aid commitments to least developed countries, up from 30 per cent of the mid-1990s. In real terms, that was more than half of the increasing aid flows to least developed countries between 2002 and 2008. There is concern that assistance to productive sectors is underfunded; hence some re-balancing will be required in the new programme of action, taking into account that unless additionality is secured, an increase in one area would often lead to a decline in another.

57. In recent years, South-South development cooperation has expanded beyond the expectations in the Brussels Programme of Action. Several developing countries, in particular Brazil, China, India, South Africa and Turkey, have considerably increased their involvement in development cooperation. South-South development cooperation is geared more towards infrastructure and productive sectors than developed-country ODA. In addition, South-South cooperation often integrates financial support with capacity-building, foreign direct investment and trade cooperation. While the potential of South-South cooperation needs to be harnessed, it remains a complement and supplement to North-South cooperation, not a substitute.

58. Progress has been made in addressing the financial and technical assistance needs of least developed countries in the context of trade capacity-building and implementation of World Trade Organization agreements. In 2008, least developed countries received 10.5 billion, or 25 per cent of the total official development assistance to them (about $38 billion) as Aid for Trade. However, the share of least developed countries in total Aid for Trade disbursements to all developing countries

fell slightly, from 32 per cent in 2002 and 2003 to 28 per cent in 2007 and 2008. That took place despite the establishment of the Integrated Framework (IF) and Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF), a dedicated source for least developed countries. Total IF and EIF expenditures over this period were equivalent to less than 0.1 per cent of total aid for trade disbursements to least developed countries. In spite of an increase from $37 million in 2006 to more than $100 million in 2010, as at June 2010, their resources are extremely limited, amounting to an average of just over $2 million per least developed country. Moreover, as at 31 March 2010, only 27 per cent of EIF funds had been allocated and all of the disbursements had been spent for studies and overheads. EIF has, nevertheless, evolved considerably during the Programme of Action period, and could address many supply-side concerns of least developed countries in the realm of trade. However, it needs to be scaled up in a major way and actual trade-related infrastructure and capacity-building projects need to be funded.

59. During the last decade, debt relief through the Highly Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative and since the 2005 Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative (MDRI) — neither of which is specific to least developed countries — has nevertheless been effective in reducing the debt burden of least developed countries. As of July 2010, 23 least developed countries are post-completion point countries out of 31 least developed countries eligible to benefit from HIPC or MDRI. Recent bilateral debt write-off and debt buy-back operations have also been important. Nevertheless, as of late 2010, 20 least developed countries were in a situation of debt distress, or at high risk of debt distress, and five are non-HIPC countries. The financial crisis and debt incurred to ride it out have caused the debt burden to rise.

60. Foreign direct investment is crucial for least developed countries, as it is both a source of finance for investments in productive capacities and the principal means for acquiring technology and other intangible assets, production and marketing skills, and employment generation. Foreign direct investment flows to least developed countries increased sixfold between 2000 and 2008, exceeding $32 billion in 2008. Over 80 per cent of these flows went to natural-resource-rich African least developed countries, though a number of island least developed countries have also received growing inflows relating to investments in tourism, transport services and human resources. Owing to large profit remittances, however, the net transfers associated with foreign direct investment have been negative since 2005. In their peak year, 2008, foreign direct investment inflows accounted for more than 4 per cent of GDP for 21 least developed countries. Thereafter they fell by 13 per cent, from $32 billion to less than $28 billion in 2009. Compared to declines in other developing countries, this one was less steep; such decline varied considerably among least developed countries.

61. Foreign direct investment from emerging economies in least developed countries is growing at a faster rate than that from traditional partners, especially from China, India and Malaysia. In 2008 there was substantial increase in infrastructure investments from Asian countries to sub-Saharan Africa. As for intra-African foreign direct investment, 70 per cent of it originating from South Africa, it is smaller in scale and is directed more to services and manufactures than to natural resources.

62. Given the prominence of natural resources and, to some extent, service sectors in foreign direct investment, technology transfer through foreign direct investment

has been inadequate. Linkages between natural resource exploitation and the rest of the economy are limited, and the technology and the skills are very sector-specific. A specific conduit for technology transfer that is mentioned in the Brussels Programme of Action is article 66 (2) of the TRIPS Agreement (see A/CONF.191/13, chap. II, para. 50 (ii), (f)), which imposes an obligation on developed country members to provide incentives to enterprises and institutions in their territories to promote and encourage technology transfer to least developed country members of the World Trade Organization to enable them to create a sound and viable technological base. Various studies of article 66 (2) implementation have agreed that standards to assess compliance are lacking and reports do not adequately inform about execution.

63. Despite efforts by least developed countries to attract more non-resource extracting foreign direct investment through liberalization and bilateral agreements, they did not have much effect owing to the perception of high risk and their small market size. Thus efforts by least developed countries need to be complemented by incentive schemes from home countries.

64. Although remittances are not a new phenomenon, their importance for least developed countries has been increasing over the past decade, from $6.1 billion in 2000 to $17.5 billion in 2007 and further to $23 billion in 2008. As remittances are only briefly mentioned in the Brussels Programme of Action, their potential for productive investment and brain circulation needs to be taken into account in a new programme of action.

E. Progress towards graduation

65. Graduation from the least developed country status is the ultimate aim of the Brussels Programme of Action, or of any programme of action on least developed countries. From this perspective, the Brussels Programme of Action has not been successful. Since its adoption, only Cape Verde (2007) and Maldives (2011) have graduated. Samoa's graduation, which was to become effective on 17 December 2010, has been postponed for three years. In the 2009 triennial review, Equatorial Guinea, whose GNI was almost four times the threshold, was also recommended for graduation. Tuvalu and Vanuatu were considered eligible but not recommended for graduation owing to doubts about the sustainability of their progress. Kiribati, which had met the criteria for the first time in the 2006 review, was no longer found eligible three years later.

66. The countries that are either graduating or that have been considered for graduation are the smallest of the least developed countries in terms of population, although small populations are in fact considered as a "major indicator of economic vulnerability". This can be an indication that measures undertaken, whether in the context of the Programme of Action or outside, have been effective in eliminating the deficiencies as reflected in other components of the criteria for inclusion, or that these deficiencies were easier to eliminate in very small countries. However, small island least developed countries remain especially vulnerable to the existential threat of climate change and thus deserve special attention.

67. Most of the small island least developed countries and all Asian least developed countries except Afghanistan have either met one graduation threshold or are showing signs of progress towards one or two graduation thresholds. The

countries left out of these groupings are most of the African least developed countries, pointing at larger obstacles in commodity dependent countries.

68. The preparation of an exit strategy during the pre-graduation period, in cooperation with development partners and United Nations support, is crucial in order to ensure that the loss of least developed country status is associated with a gradual phase out of benefits specific to least developed countries. The preparation of such smooth transition strategy is called for by the General Assembly in its resolution 59/209, with a view to avoiding abrupt disruption of the country's development. In this respect, the European Union provides for at least a three-year continuation of Everything but Arms duty-free and quota-free market access to all graduated countries. Access to the Enhanced Integrated Framework was also extended by three years to graduated countries. The systemic adoption of smooth transition measures by other development partners, including the United Nations system, would facilitate the graduation process considerably.

IV. Lessons learned

A. Focus on vulnerabilities of least developed countries

69. During the period covered by the Brussels Programme of Action, least developed countries not only achieved higher growth rates and some progress towards reaching the Millennium Development Goals, but they also increased their participation in trade and received higher financial flows. However, their structural transformation was very limited and thus their vulnerability to external shocks was not reduced. Likewise, improved economic performance in least developed countries did not contribute sufficiently to poverty reduction because growth was driven by capital intensive extractive industries, such as fuel and mineral, with limited impact on employment creation and diversification. As the occurrence of external shocks has increased in recent years, such as the fluctuation of commodity prices, the next programme of action needs to focus more strongly on generating this transformation.

70. The focus on export-led growth and integration into the global economy resulted in insufficient attention on endogenously driven growth. The development strategy for the next decade should complement the export-led and market-oriented growth strategies by focusing on the strengthened role of endogenous productive capacity, investment in infrastructural development, technological capacity-building, and the fomenting of private sector capacity, which can stimulate enhanced and sustainable economic growth.

71. In order to maximize the poverty alleviating effect of economic growth, growth needs to be steady, sustained over a long period of time and inclusive. Whereas the Brussels Programme of Action laid out a comprehensive development framework addressing both poverty and human development, as well as growth and economic development, the specific channels through which growth can impact on poverty were not sufficiently highlighted and did not receive sufficient attention in its implementation. The new programme of action should stress the importance of targeting investments directly to employment of the poor and vulnerable, enhancing their productivity and addressing inequality through redistributive mechanisms. There has to be a virtuous circle of social and human development interventions and

outcomes and those meant to enhance productive infrastructure and capacity and generate jobs on a sustainable basis.

72. The Brussels Programme of Action did not address the different needs among the least developed countries arising from their specific situations and vulnerabilities, including the size of the population, the land-locked or sea-locked geographic characteristics, extreme dependency on a primary commodity, the level of exports diversification of their economies, particular vulnerability to natural disasters, deforestation, desertification and climate change, and conflict situations. The effectiveness of a new programme of action will be enhanced if it fosters the design and implementation of policies, instruments and support measures flexible enough to address the specific needs of each least developed country, while focusing on their common vulnerabilities.

73. While the Brussels Programme of Action aims to reduce vulnerabilities of least developed countries, it does not focus much on providing readily available support measures to reduce specific risks, such as from commodity price fluctuations, devastating effects of natural disasters, individual risks of households, etc. In areas such as social protection and insurance new approaches have been developed over the past decade, which should be taken into account in a new programme of action. New mechanisms to reduce commodity price fluctuations and their adverse effects on least developed countries also need to be explored.

74. Some important policy areas did not receive the adequate measure of attention in the Programme of Action, including the areas of agriculture, employment and ICT, and the special needs arising from fragile and conflict situations in some least developed countries. These issues need to be addressed adequately in the new programme of action.

75. Overall, the marginalization of least developed countries with low shares in international flows, including trade, foreign direct investment, remittances, limited access to international financial markets and technology and increasing volatility of commodity prices, exchange rates, etc., together with new and emerging challenges, has further increased their vulnerability, despite some progress made. Thus a new programme of action needs to focus on these vulnerabilities and revise priorities to address issues specific to least developed countries.

B. Mainstreaming and coherence of the Brussels Programme of Action

76. For both the least developed countries and development partners, the multitude of commitments under various internationally agreed initiatives creates a maze of commitments. While outright contradictions may be scarce, inconsistencies appear. For example, regional cooperation is desirable in the Brussels Programme of Action, which is being implemented through the participation of least developed countries in regional groupings. However, this limits their ability to raise tariffs to protect their infant industries, which is another recommended action of the Programme of Action (see A/CONF.191/13, chap. II, para. 60 (b)). Assisting the cotton sector of least developed countries, in line with the Programme of Action, while subsidizing production in developed countries, and discrepancies between aid and trade policies of developed country partners are other examples of incoherence.

77. While least developed countries have included most aspects of the Brussels Programme of Action in their national development plans, explicit reference to the Programme of Action and general awareness within countries appears to be low. Greater country ownership can be achieved through mainstreaming the Programme of Action into the respective national development framework, including, where they exist, poverty reduction strategy papers, national development strategies and sectoral plans, and the United Nations Development Assistance Framework.

78. Mainstreaming of the Brussels Programme of Action into aid, trade and development strategies of donors is a precondition for its successful implementation and coherence of policies. In a survey of websites of principal bilateral aid agencies in September 2010, no explicit reference to the Programme of Action was detected, with the exception of the European Union mentioning all African least developed countries. However, many of the priority recipients of bilateral donors are least developed countries, with Mozambique being mentioned 13 times, followed by the United Republic of Tanzania 12 times and Ethiopia 11 times.

79. Similarly, at the global level there is a need to mainstream the new programme of action into international partnerships, forums, processes and compacts in relevant policy areas and negotiations. The programme of action should provide the legislative basis and the political impetus to maintain least developed countries' focus in United Nations and other processes such as financing for development, the World Trade Organization/Doha negotiations, reform of multilateral financial institutions, global and financial monitoring systems, Group of Twenty (G-20), the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio plus 20), climate change governance negotiations, and social development, population and gender-related processes.

80. Despite their vulnerability, least developed countries as a group account for a significant share of the world's strategic minerals, including oil, gas, coal, gold, silver, diamonds, bauxite, cobalt, uranium, coltan and many more. They have vast arable land for agriculture, large rainforests that play a crucial role in combating global warming, great biodiversity, abundant renewable energy resources, enormous reserves of fresh water and precious marine and coastal resources. Equitably harnessed and properly managed, all these resources can yield high returns on investments for the benefit of the least developed countries and the global economy.

81. As the principles of genuine partnership and country ownership have been only partially realized, they need to be strengthened. Furthermore, the principle of market considerations needs to be balanced with a redefined role of the State, especially in the light of the recent experiences with global crises. The principles of solidarity and equity could be added, in recognition of the close interdependence between developing and developed countries and the stakes that each has in the others' prosperity, including peace and security issues.

C. Effectiveness of international support measures

82. ODA is not only addressed under commitment 7; it is also mentioned in the context of many key actions by development partners throughout the Brussels Programme of Action, including in commitment 3, which calls for "provision of social infrastructure and social services" (see A/CONF.191/13, chap. II, para. 32 (ii) (a)), and commitment 4, which calls for supporting "least developed country efforts to

upgrade and develop physical infrastructures" (see A/CONF.191/13, chap. II, para. 48 (ii) (a)), and in commitment 6, which calls for "providing assistance, through financial, technical and/or other forms of assistance to least developed countries' efforts to develop and implement national strategies for sustainable development" (see A/CONF.191/13, chap. II, para. 75 (ii) (e)). Thus, the successful implementation of the Programme of Action is closely related to the fulfilment of ODA commitments. However, in terms of quantity, donors provided only 0.09 per cent of their GNI in ODA on average, falling short of the 0.15 to 0.2 per cent target. Had the 0.2 per cent GNI target been met in 2008 in all DAC countries, the result would have been an additional $42.5 billion in ODA to least developed countries.

83. Apart from the quantity of aid, its quality is important. The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action promote ownership and leadership, predictability, mutual accountability and transparency, conditionality, and earmarking of aid, which need to be addressed. These principles are important for both recipients and donors in order to achieve the quality desired in the Brussels Programme of Action (see A/CONF.191/13, chap. II, para. 84 (b)). In addition, most ODA was focused on social sectors and did not sufficiently target the productive sector and economic infrastructure in the past decade. To some extent the increase in Aid for Trade started to counterbalance this trend and led to greater ODA allocation to economic development.

84. Least developed countries have assumed a greater role in the design and implementation of their development plans, including their poverty reduction strategy papers. However, the way in which poverty reduction strategy papers are designed and implemented is still strongly influenced by donors' policy conditionality, monitoring benchmarks and financing choices. OECD peer reviews and reports on aid effectiveness provide significant avenues for donors to assess and improve their aid performance, but further improvements in the quality of aid are required, including reduced conditionalities. In addition, further accumulation of debt by least developed countries needs to be avoided through the use of highly concessional loans and grants.

85. HIPC and MDRI have also deeply influenced development in many least developed countries, though not all least developed countries are eligible. However, owing to increased lending during the financial crisis, it is likely that debt distress will continue to be a major concern for least developed countries and debt relief must have a prominent place in the next programme of action. Creditors should consider the possible extension of the sunset clause following the adaptation of criteria and clauses for the potential inclusion of new countries, in addition to a debt moratorium to cushion the effects of the financial crisis. Debt swaps that will increase investment in least developed countries should also be explored.

86. The expectations of the Brussels Programme of Action from foreign direct investment have been only partially fulfilled. The results are positive as a source of funds, but without a discernable impact on structural change. Both host and home country measures will have to be designed and implemented so that a positive impact of foreign direct investment with respect to value addition and retention, employment creation and technology transfer can be generated. This might include special incentives from home countries, including developed countries and developing countries in a position to do so, to stimulate foreign direct investment flows to infrastructure and productive sectors in least developed countries.

Public/private initiatives need to be fostered in particular in the area of infrastructure to raise sufficient resources, using ODA to leverage private investment, as without ODA, risk averse investors will continue to stay away from least developed countries except for a few "new" areas, such as mobile telephony, which appear less risky.

87. The provision of preferential market access for products from least developed countries has increased significantly over the past decade. All but one of the developed countries meet the duty-free and quota-free market access threshold of 97 per cent of products originating from least developed countries, and several go beyond that. The remaining 3 per cent of tariff lines are not covered in all duty-free and quota-free schemes. However, owing to the concentration of least developed country exports in few tariff lines, only 81 per cent of imports from least developed countries in 2008 were admitted duty free into developed countries. The value of tariff preferences was reduced owing to preference erosion following from general tariff reductions. Thus the Brussels Programme of Action target for duty-free and quota-free market access for all products from all least developed countries needs to be implemented in a timely manner and countries experiencing losses from preference erosion should be supported.

88. Stringent rules of origin applied by developed countries coupled with least developed countries' weak supply capacity resulted in low use of tariff preferences. The Sixth World Trade Organization Ministerial Conference called on developed countries to ensure that preferential rules of origin applicable to imports from least developed countries are simple and transparent and contribute to facilitating market access. The possibility of cumulation of origin for inputs from all other least developed countries and developing countries in the same region would be especially useful and would also foster trade among developing countries. In addition, trading partners should remove non-tariff barriers and support the ability of least developed countries to comply with standards and quality requirements.

89. During the financial and economic crisis, many least developed countries experiencing a contraction in private external financing benefited from increased official flows, in particular from multilateral sources. In 2008 and 2009, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and regional development banks increased their lending significantly to least developed countries. However, the flow of resources was not always adequate in terms of timeliness and volume, which should be addressed in a new programme of action.

90. There are several explanations why the existing international support measures to meet the Programme of Action goals generated limited results. To some extent they were not adequate. There were also difficulties in implementing the measures owing to shortcomings of both donors and least developed countries. Finally, the international support measures may be necessary but they are not sufficient to address the structural handicaps affecting the least developed countries.

D. International environment

91. In general, the global economic regimes that enable or constrain development in least developed countries are much more powerful than the special international support measures for least developed countries. This has been demonstrated by the devastating effects of the financial crisis; it is also relevant to the Doha

Development Round, outcomes of climate change negotiations, reform of the international financial architecture, etc.

92. Least developed countries comprise a special category at the United Nations and the World Trade Organization. United Nations agencies have several special funds for least developed countries, in the context of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the United Nations Capital Development Fund, the World Food Programme, and the World Meteorological Organization. Most United Nations agencies have dedicated least developed country programmes, and total United Nations support for least developed countries increased from $2.4 billion in 2000 to $7.0 billion in 2008. Least developed countries and their specific concerns have also been singled out in recent negotiations, such as the climate change negotiations and the Millennium Development Goals summit negotiations. However, at international financial institutions the least developed country category is not recognized and does not acquire special treatment. Instead the "low income" category is used, which has a considerable overlap, but also major differences, with 14 least developed countries not being classified as low income in 2010 (see annex, table 19).

93. Better representation of least developed countries in decision-making at the global level is another aspiration of the Brussels Programme of Action (see A/CONF.191/13, chap. II, para. 29 (ii) (a)), which would help improve the international environment for least developed country development. In IMF, for example, least developed countries together have just 2.9 per cent of the votes — the same as Canada — despite constituting 25 per cent of the membership and 10 per cent of the total population. In the context of governance reform of the Bretton Woods institutions, developed countries have agreed to increase the voice of some large developing economies, but not that of least developed countries. During the past decade, leaders from least developed countries participated at G-8 and then at G-20 summits, but G-20 mentioned least developed countries in its communiqués for the first time in 2005 (see annex, table 18). Africa, which has the most least developed countries, was the focus of the Gleneagles summit. Thus least developed countries and their issues received some attention at these international forums, but their participation has been on an ad hoc basis and needs to be institutionalized.

94. Wider recognition of least developed country status, including by international financial institutions, would stimulate and facilitate better mainstreaming of the proposals in a programme of action into development policies. Proposed actions seem more valuable and more prone to be internalized when concrete benefits are associated with them. New international support architecture should draw legislative and normative authority and inspiration from a new programme of action, and contain least developed country-specific mechanisms that channel least developed country-specific support and concrete deliverables.

E. Monitoring and evaluation

95. One of the institutional achievements following the Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries was the establishment of the Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States (OHRLLS), which had the specific mandate to mobilize and coordinate international support and resources for the

effective implementation of programmes of action for the three groups of countries (least developed countries, landlocked developing countries and small island developing States); enhance monitoring and follow-up to the three Programmes of Action; awareness-raising and advocacy with respect to the three groups of countries; and reporting on the implementation of the Brussels and Almaty Programmes of Action as effective tools for reaching the international development goals for the concerned countries. The resources for OHRLLS have tripled over the past decade, indicating the priority given by the Secretary-General to the follow-up activities of the Programme of Action on Least Developed Countries.

96. The establishment of OHRLLS, led by the High Representative, who reports directly to the Secretary-General, has brought very high visibility at the political level to the issues of the least developed countries, landlocked developing countries and small island developing States. The High Representative has improved the coordination and mainstreaming of issues of least developed countries in the United Nations system through working with the executive heads of organizations of the United Nations system, such as the Chief Executives Board, the Senior Management Group, the Executive Committee of Economic and Social Affairs, and the United Nations Development Group. OHRLLS has also successfully coordinated the work of the United Nations system in implementing and following up the Brussels Programme of Action through the meetings of the inter-agency consultative group. OHRLLS prepares an annual report of the Secretary-General to the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council on the review of the implementation of the Programme of Action, with specific indicators to quantify the progress, which remains critical to ensuring mutual accountability to achieve enhanced development outcome. The Office also coordinated the mid-term evaluation of the Brussels Programme of Action and undertook advocacy to raise awareness of the Programme of Action.

97. One shortcoming with respect to the monitoring and evaluation of the Brussels Programme of Action, however, is the lack of adequate data at the national level for monitoring some targets. Thus data collection efforts in least developed countries need to be improved and goals and targets for a new programme of action need to be balanced and to refer to available indicators. Monitoring and follow-up should not focus only on goals and targets, but also on actions by both least developed countries and development partners to strengthen the principle of mutual accountability. The difficulty of establishing a causal link between the Programme of Action and any social and economic progress achieved in least developed countries in related areas covered by the Programme of Action has been recognized. Thus following a rigorous system and methodology of putting the Programme of Action at the heart of national development strategies and linking it to relevant international action and forums is crucial. There is also a need to enhance the involvement of parliamentarians, civil society organizations, and the private sector in monitoring, follow-up and sharing best practices.

98. Furthermore, some actions of the Brussels Programme of Action require a long implementation period (e.g., promoting the efficiency of markets) (see A/CONF.191/13, chap. II, para. 24 (i) (d)). The impact of some actions on development will be realized over the long term (e.g., education and health) (see A/CONF.191/13, chap. II, para. 30). While results might therefore not always be recorded, these facts call for sustained efforts to achieve development goals in all least developed countries.

V. Conclusions and recommendations

99. Economic and social development in least developed countries was better during the implementation period of the Programme of Action than in the previous decade, albeit with large differences among individual least developed countries. The implementation of development strategies in least developed countries improved and development partners increased their contribution. The overall economic conditions in the world and the emphasis placed by the international community on the Millennium Development Goals and on Africa contributed significantly to the achievements.

100. The Brussels Programme of Action has had a positive role to play in the progress of least developed country development, but the specific goals and objectives of the Programme of Action have not been attained fully. The structural transformation that would put the least developed countries on a path of sustainable growth has not occurred. The poorest and most vulnerable countries still have a long way to go to fully achieve economic, social and sustainable development, poverty eradication, employment generation, structural transformation and graduation from least developed country status. The Programme of Action remains unfinished business. There is a need for continued and enhanced support through a new programme of action, as business as usual will not suffice.

101. There seems to be a trade-off between comprehensiveness and operationality. Emphasizing and targeting priority areas for support, better matching these areas with goals and targets, and identifying specific means and tools to reach them would illuminate the road towards reaching a select number of specific and actionable goals of the Programme of Action.

102. Treating least developed countries as a group on the basis of their low per capita income, human asset development and economic vulnerability is the fundamental premise for special measures in their favour. This needs to be complemented by national and international responses that are tailor-made for each least developed country in order to achieve greater effectiveness of support measures. Geographic characteristics (small island developing States, landlocked developing countries), economic characteristics (mineral or agricultural export dependence, food or energy insecurity), vulnerability to natural phenomena and conflict situations need to be taken into account in this respect.

103. Greater ownership and leadership are indispensable in the implementation of a programme of action. In least developed countries this requires mainstreaming, integration and highlighting in national development strategies, plans and programmes. Least developed countries also need to identify authorities to oversee implementation of these strategies, as well as multi-stakeholder engagement by parliamentarians, civil society organizations, the private sector, and executive branches in related processes. Least developed countries need to establish a developmental State that can encourage structural transformation diversification into competitive manufacturing and services sectors, and harnessing the power of a robust domestic private sector. Only a strong developmental State may commit to good developmental governance and secure the necessary policy flexibility.

104. The assessment of the Brussels Programme of Action reveals that the Programme of Action does not adequately cover some emerging challenges that have significant effects on least developed countries. A new programme of action

should take these into account, especially as they affect problems that are specific to least developed countries, such as the following:

(a) New players have emerged on the world scene, including large and influential developing countries and sizeable foundations and non-governmental organizations. While the traditional development partners are still very relevant to the development of the least developed countries, the fourth programme of action should also include support measures that can be put into place by the new actors, including financial and technical assistance, market access, and investment support as a complement to, but not a substitute for, support from traditional donors. Regional integration, including infrastructure, should also be given greater prominence;

(b) The multiple crises created a new consciousness regarding instabilities and vulnerabilities of the global economy, in particular the hazards of overdependence on external resources and external demand. Thus a new programme of action would need to refocus attention on structural transformation of least developed countries through increasing productive capacity and diversification and strengthening home-grown development paths. It would also need to address these vulnerabilities through new insurance-type mechanisms and commodity price stabilization schemes;

(c) The new programme of action should take into consideration the impact of climate change on least developed countries in terms of food security, water stress, disease, disaster risk, ecological degradation, and migration, requiring concerted action. Least developed countries have a particular opportunity to leap-frog into green technologies and green industrialization and thereby harness the benefits of green growth;

(d) Greater stress needs to be placed on tapping the enormous human resources potential, especially the large youth population. A purposeful scheme for building skills across a wide spectrum of needs in least developed countries' economies should be developed. In addition, in order to build least developed countries' competitiveness in the global economy and overcome economic vulnerability, technological upgrading and innovation, as well as shifting to the knowledge economy, would be crucial;

(e) Financial resources need to increase, as they are key to the achievement of sustained and inclusive economic growth, sustainable development, and poverty eradication, including gender equity. Considerably scaled-up and qualitatively enhanced mobilization of domestic resources, ODA, private financial flows, especially foreign direct investment, and innovative sources of financing, including remittances, and a crisis mitigation and resilience-building fund should be key deliverables of a new programme of action. In addition, dedicated regional and global facilities and mechanisms to provide support to least developed countries in priority areas need to be established; e.g., a food security fund or a technology bank.

105. Least developed countries have special needs and interests that call for their special treatment in terms of policy space and the nature and magnitude of support. The response needs to be in the context of mutual accountability between least developed countries and partners at the national, regional and global levels. A genuine partnership against poverty and a compact for prosperity is needed to unlock the huge potential of least developed countries and avoid a developmental

catastrophe that could engulf the world. The peoples of least developed countries need and deserve solidarity and support from the world, which has high stakes in least developed country development. The cost of not doing enough is high and the dividends of supporting sustainable development, economic growth and poverty eradication in least developed countries are considerable. Qualitatively and quantitatively scaled up, enhanced and sustained flows of ODA to least developed countries from developed countries and multilateral financial institutions are critical for the next programme of action to achieve a quantum leap in least developed country development and socio-economic and structural progress and transformation, as well as their graduation.

Annex

Statistical data

Explanatory notes

1. Years separated by a hyphen (such as 1995-2000) normally indicate data based on averages in the period shown, but in some cases indicate a change over the period. Years separated by a slash (such as 2000/07) indicate that data are shown for the latest year available in the period, or, in the case of years before 2000, a mid-point where data are available within the period indicated.

2. Figures may not add to totals owing to rounding.

3. A dash indicates data are not available.

Table 1
Economic growth, fixed capital formation, foreign direct investment and population

	Gross domestic product (GDP)													*Population*	
	Annual growth rate of GDP (constant United States dollars) (percentage)				*Per capita GDP (constant United States dollars)*		*Per capita GDP (current United States dollars)*		*Gross fixed capital formation as percentage of GDP, current prices*			*Foreign direct investment as percentage of GDP*		*(Thousands)*	*Growth per year (percentage)*
Least developed countries	*1995-2000*	*2000-2005*	*2007*	*2008*	*2000*	*2008*	*2007*	*2008*	*2000*	*2007*	*2008*	*2000*	*2008*	*2008*	*2008*
Africa															
Oil exporters															
Angola	6.1	10.4	20.3	14.8	818	1 736	1 712	1 942	12.1	13.3	12.1	9.6	44.4	18 021	2.7
Chad	2.7	14.8	0.2	0.3	259	400	660	765	15.2	15.9	15.1	8.3	10.0	10 914	2.7
Equatorial Guinea	33.9	27.3	23.2	15.2	1 651	6 605	16 666	27 130	61.9	31.1	22.4	9.5	7.2	659	2.6
Sudan	9.4	9.1	10.5	7.6	921	1 559	1 388	1 700	12.1	20.3	17.5	3.0	3.7	41 348	2.3
Subtotal (oil exporters)	**8.4**	**10.1**	**13.1**	**9.6**	**806**	**1 472**	**1 500**	**1 854**	**14.6**	**19.1**	**16.6**	**6.0**	**15.4**	**70 941**	**2.4**
Non-oil exporters															
Benin	4.8	4.1	4.6	5.0	431	462	657	767	18.0	19.9	20.3	2.5	1.8	8 662	3.2
Burkina Faso	6.5	6.3	3.6	4.5	444	527	459	522	19.2	20.9	21.1	0.9	1.7	15 234	3.5
Burundi	-1.2	2.1	3.6	4.5	150	152	119	138	7.5	11.6	13.1	1.7	0.0	8 074	3.0
Central African Republic	2.3	-1.0	3.7	2.2	451	410	404	464	11.1	8.7	10.1	0.1	6.0	4 339	1.9
Comoros	1.5	2.8	-1.0	1.0	505	490	720	802	10.1	10.4	13.5	—	—	661	2.3
Democratic Republic of the Congo	-3.9	4.3	6.3	6.2	102	118	154	181	10.5	20.2	24.2	0.4	8.6	64 257	2.8
Djibouti	0.5	2.8	4.8	5.8	709	812	1 016	1 155	12.3	42.2	46.7	0.6	23.9	849	1.8
Eritrea	1.1	2.6	1.3	1.0	361	309	275	300	22.0	11.5	10.9	4.0	0.0	4 927	3.0
Ethiopia	4.6	6.4	11.1	11.3	228	347	244	319	20.3	24.8	21.2	1.7	0.4	80 713	2.6
Gambia	4.2	2.0	6.3	4.9	755	776	509	636	36.7	34.2	44.0	5.6	5.9	1 660	2.8
Guinea	4.5	2.9	1.8	4.0	501	534	420	505	18.9	11.4	14.2	0.3	27.2	9 833	2.3
Guinea-Bissau	-0.2	-0.4	3.7	3.1	203	179	232	257	15.1	15.0	15.6	0.3	3.7	1 575	2.2
Lesotho	-1.7	2.8	5.1	3.5	448	556	823	788	40.4	24.4	28.5	4.0	12.3	2 049	0.9
Liberia	34.9	-4.6	9.5	7.1	215	160	180	219	7.3	20.0	18.8	3.9	17.3	3 793	4.6
Madagascar	3.8	2.3	6.3	5.0	239	251	399	488	16.2	27.4	34.0	2.1	15.8	19 111	2.7
Malawi	4.2	3.2	7.9	7.4	266	311	240	278	17.5	24.4	25.0	1.7	0.9	14 846	2.8

Least developed countries	Gross domestic product (GDP)													Population	
	Annual growth rate of GDP (constant United States dollars) (percentage)				Per capita GDP (constant United States dollars)		Per capita GDP (current United States dollars)		Gross fixed capital formation as percentage of GDP, current prices			Foreign direct investment as percentage of GDP		(Thousands)	Growth per year (percentage)
	1995-2000	2000-2005	2007	2008	2000	2008	2007	2008	2000	2007	2008	2000	2008	2008	2008
Mali	4.5	6.4	4.3	4.7	356	461	576	677	18.9	19.4	18.4	3.1	1.5	12 706	2.4
Mauritania	2.5	4.3	1.0	2.2	538	719	905	1 017	22.4	22.1	20.8	3.7	3.2	3 215	2.4
Mozambique	9.4	8.8	7.4	7.0	300	466	371	440	31.0	17.2	21.1	3.2	6.0	22 383	2.3
Niger	3.2	5.5	3.3	5.9	296	337	300	354	13.4	23.3	25.4	0.5	2.8	14 704	4.0
Rwanda	10.2	5.7	7.9	11.2	332	463	361	458	18.0	18.0	22.7	0.5	2.3	9 721	2.8
Sao Tome and Principe	1.6	6.4	6.0	5.8	996	1 423	919	1 108	35.8	64.1	65.4	5.0	18.3	160	1.6
Senegal	4.7	4.7	4.8	2.5	848	949	949	1 088	22.4	26.9	30.7	1.3	5.3	12 211	2.7
Sierra Leone	-10.1	12.8	6.4	5.5	106	178	360	418	8.0	6.7	14.5	4.2	1.3	5 560	2.6
Somalia	2.1	2.9	2.6	2.6	103	106	307	298	20.3	20.3	20.3	0.0	3.3	8 926	2.2
Togo	2.2	1.2	3.5	1.1	373	344	403	446	15.1	17.6	12.4	3.2	2.4	6 459	2.5
Uganda	6.4	6.6	8.6	9.5	323	437	443	500	17.8	22.4	23.8	2.9	5.0	31 657	3.3
United Republic of Tanzania	4.4	7.0	7.1	7.5	242	335	419	502	16.3	29.0	30.8	2.7	3.5	42 484	2.9
Zambia	2.7	4.8	5.8	6.3	382	478	943	1 144	17.2	26.4	25.1	3.8	6.5	12 620	2.5
Subtotal (non-oil exporters)	**4.1**	**5.3**	**6.6**	**6.8**	**280**	**353**	**368**	**436**	**18.5**	**22.8**	**24.1**	**2.1**	**5.1**	**423 391**	**2.8**
Subtotal (Africa)	**5.4**	**7.0**	**9.1**	**8.0**	**357**	**513**	**531**	**640**	**17.5**	**21.3**	**21.0**	**3.0**	**9.2**	**494 332**	**2.7**
Asia															
Afghanistan	-3.5	20.1	16.2	3.4	132	333	385	466	14.3	30.6	28.6	0.0	2.4	27 208	3.5
Bangladesh	5.2	5.4	6.4	6.2	317	438	435	494	23.0	24.5	24.2	1.3	1.4	160 000	1.4
Bhutan	6.9	7.7	21.4	6.6	833	1 352	1 843	1 933	49.1	38.7	39.7	0.0	2.2	687	1.6
Cambodia	7.1	9.3	10.2	6.0	212	377	603	769	18.3	19.4	21.0	4.1	7.3	14 562	1.7
Lao People's Democratic Republic	6.2	6.3	7.9	7.5	295	438	675	858	20.9	39.7	36.8	2.1	1.2	6 205	1.9
Maldives	8.3	4.8	6.0	5.8	1 503	2 333	3 509	4 131	26.3	52.1	44.7	2.1	4.3	305	1.4
Myanmar	6.8	6.8	5.5	2.0	205	324	375	578	11.8	15.5	14.9	2.9	1.0	49 563	0.9
Nepal	4.8	3.1	4.7	5.6	273	308	437	465	19.2	21.0	23.1	0.0	0.0	28 810	1.8

Least developed countries	Gross domestic product (GDP)													Population	
	Annual growth rate of GDP (constant United States dollars) (percentage)				Per capita GDP (constant United States dollars)		Per capita GDP (current United States dollars)		Gross fixed capital formation as percentage of GDP, current prices			Foreign direct investment as percentage of GDP		(Thousands)	Growth per year (percentage)
	1995-2000	2000-2005	2007	2008	2000	2008	2007	2008	2000	2007	2008	2000	2008	2008	2008
Timor-Leste	-3.7	0.9	16.2	6.8	241	224	426	518	37.6	28.1	23.2		0.1	1 098	3.2
Yemen	8.4	3.8	4.7	3.9	400	434	1 111	1 356	16.4	18.2	17.9	0.1	1.5	22 917	2.9
Subtotal	**5.3**	**6.1**	**7.0**	**5.2**	**282**	**399**	**489**	**593**	**20.5**	**22.9**	**22.3**	**1.3**	**1.8**	**311 356**	**1.7**
Pacific															
Kiribati	9.4	1.7	-1.8	6.3	442	422	741	804	50.2	77.5	77.3	38.4	2.5	97	1.6
Samoa	4.1	5.3	6.4	-3.4	816	1 081	3 041	2 988	14.2	9.1	8.7	-0.7	1.0	179	0.0
Solomon Islands	-2.5	1.1	10.0	6.0	608	651	1 173	1 284	18.3	12.0	12.6	0.4	11.5	511	2.5
Tuvalu	1.9	5.7	2.0	2.0	1 276	1 705	3 050	3 213	54.7	55.8	55.8	-7.5	5.2	10	0.4
Vanuatu	2.2	0.9	6.8	5.7	1 108	1 138	2 225	2 388	28.5	28.6	28.9	8.3	6.0	234	2.6
Subtotal	**0.9**	**2.1**	**7.4**	**3.5**	**750**	**825**	**1 719**	**1 804**	**22.3**	**19.4**	**19.8**	**3.0**	**4.0**	**1 030**	**2.0**
Latin America and the Caribbean															
Haiti	2.1	-0.5	3.2	1.3	272	248	663	717	12.9	12.1	12.9	0.4	0.4	9 876	1.6
Total least developed countries	**5.3**	**6.6**	**8.4**	**7.0**	**327**	**467**	**518**	**624**	**18.7**	**21.7**	**21.3**	**2.2**	**6.5**	**816 594**	**2.3**
Total developing countries	**4.4**	**5.4**	**7.7**	**5.7**	**1 288**	**1 819**	**2 749**	**3 165**	**23.2**	**27.1**	**29.3**	**3.7**	**3.6**	**5 418 736**	**1.4**

Sources: United Nations Statistics Division, National Accounts Main Aggregates database (http://unstats.un.org/unsd/snaama/introduction.asp, accessed on 10 February 2010); United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), Foreign Direct Investment database (www.unctad.org/Template/Page.asp?intItemID=1923, accessed on 1 February 2010), and UNCTAD Central Statistics and Information Retrieval Branch; United Nations Population Division, *World Population Prospects: The 2008 Revision*, data online (http://www.un.org/esa/population, accessed on 15 March 2010).

Table 2
Poverty and hunger

Least developed countries	Population poverty rate (percentage)			Food insecurity					Population growth per year (percentage)	Refugees, internally displaced persons		Life expectancy	
				Population undernourished									
	International purchasing power parity dollar income of 1.25/day (estimate)		National estimate	Percentage		Percentage difference	Food crisis countries			In country (thousands)	Outside country (thousands)	Years	Change in years
	1990/99	2000/07	1998/04	1990/92	2004/06	1990-2006	•	+	2010	2008	2008	2005/10	1995-2010
Africa													
Angola	—	54	—	66	46	-20			2.7	16	172	43	2
Benin	—	47	29	28	19	-9			3.2	7	<0.05	57	2
Burkina Faso	71	57	46	14	10	-4			3.5	1	1	52	2
Burundi	86	81	68	44	63	19			3.0	126	288	50	4
Central African Republic	83	62	—	47	43	-4	•		1.9	206	126	45	-1
Chad	—	62	—	59	39	-20			2.7	497	58	51	-1
Comoros	—	46	—	—	—			+	2.3	—	<0.05	65	5
Democratic Republic of the Congo	—	59	—	29	76	47	•		2.8	1 615	404	47	4
Djibouti	5	19	—	—	—			+	1.8	10	1	55	2
Equatorial Guinea	—	—	—	—	—				2.6	—	<0.05	52	3
Eritrea	—	—	—	67	68	1	•		3.0	5	201	58	5
Ethiopia	61	39	44	71	46	-25	•		2.6	200-300	95	53	4
Gambia	67	34	61	20	30	10		+	2.8	15	2	59	4
Guinea	93	70	—	19	17	-2	•		2.3	22	12	56	5
Guinea-Bissau	52	49	66	—	—		•		2.2	8	1	46	2
Lesotho	56	43	68	15	15	0	•		0.9	—	<0.05	43	-13
Liberia	—	84	—	—	40		•		4.6	10	78	46	4
Madagascar	73	68	71	32	37	5		+	2.7	—	<0.05	59	4
Malawi	83	74	65	45	29	-16			2.8	11	8	48	1
Mali	86	51	64	14	11	-3			2.4	11	3	55	5
Mauritania	43	21	46	10	8	-2			2.4	27	46	64	4
Mozambique	81	75	54	59	38	-21		+	2.3	8	1	42	-4
Niger	78	66	—	38	29	-9		+	4.0	<0.05	1	57	6
Rwanda	—	77	60	45	40	-5		+	2.8	55	79	46	10

Least developed countries	Population poverty rate (percentage)			Food insecurity					Population growth per year (percentage)	Refugees, internally displaced persons		Life expectancy	
	International purchasing power parity dollar income of 1 25/day (estimate)		National estimate	Population undernourished		Percentage difference	Food crisis countries			In country (thousands)	Outside country (thousands)	Years	Change in years
				Percentage									
	1990/99	2000/07	1998/04	1990/92	2004/06	1990-2006	•	+	2010	2008	2008	2005/10	1995-2010
Sao Tome and Principe	—	34	—	—	—				1.6	—	<0.05	66	2
Senegal	54	52	—	28	26	-2		+	2.7	36	17	63	3
Sierra Leone	63	—	70	45	47	2			2.6	8	35	43	3
Somalia	—	—	—	—	—		•		2.2	1 288	582	48	4
Sudan	—	—	—	—	21				2.3	4 776[a]	437	59	3
Togo	—	39	—	45	37	-8		+	2.5	10	18	58	0
Uganda	64	52	38	19	15	-4			3.3	1 024	11	52	7
United Republic of Tanzania	73	89	36	28	35	7		+	2.9	322	4	53	4
Zambia	65	64	68	40	45	5		+	2.5	84	1	42	2
Asia						0							
Afghanistan	—	—	—	—	—				3.5	231	2856	44	2
Bangladesh	59	50	50	36	27	-9			1.4	28	17	64	5
Bhutan	—	26	—	—	—				1.6	—	106	66	7
Cambodia	49	40	35	38	26	-12			1.7	0	17	60	3
Lao People's Democratic Republic	49	44	33	27	19	-8			1.9	—	9	64	5
Maldives	—	—	—	—	—				1.4	—	<0.05	69	5
Myanmar	—	—	—	44	19	-25			0.9	791	207	62	2
Nepal	68	55	31	21	15	-6			1.8	926	6	64	4
Timor-Leste	—	53	—	—	—		•		3.2	16	<0.05	61	6
Yemen	5	18	42	30	32	2		+	2.9	241	2	63	5
Pacific													
Kiribati	—	—	—	—	—				1.6	—	<0.05	—	—
Samoa	—	—	—	—	—				0.0	—	<0.05	72	3
Solomon Islands	—	—	—	—	—			+	2.5	—	<0.05	64	3

	Population poverty rate (percentage)			Food insecurity					Population growth per year (percentage)	Refugees, internally displaced persons		Life expectancy	
	International purchasing power parity dollar income of 1.25/day (estimate)		National estimate	Population undernourished		Percentage difference	Food crisis countries			In country (thousands)	Outside country (thousands)	Years	Change in years
Least developed countries	*1990/99*	*2000/07*	*1998/04*	*1990/92*	*2004/06*	*1990-2006*	•	+	*2010*	*2008*	*2008*	*2005/10*	*1995-2010*
Tuvalu	—	—	—	—	—				0.4	—	<0.05	—	—
Vanuatu	—	—	—	—	—				2.6	<0.05	—	70	4
Latin America and the Caribbean													
Haiti	—	55	—	63	58	-5	•		1.6	36	36	61	4

Sources: World Bank, *World Development Indicators 10* (Washington, D.C.), table 2.6, and PovcalNet (http://go.worldbank.org/NT2A1XUWPO, update in progress); Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), *The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2009 — Economic crises — impacts and lessons learned* (Rome, 2009); United Nations Population Division, *World Population Prospects: The 2008 Revision*, data online (http://www.un.org/esa/population/unpop.htm, accessed on 15 March 2010); Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), *Statistical Yearbook 2007*, tables 1 and 2, and additional analysis provided by the UNHCR Field Information and Coordination Support Section.

• "Food crisis" countries requiring external assistance (FAO, *The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2008*, p. 21).

+ Countries severely affected by high commodity prices and at high risk of food crisis (FAO, 2008, p. 21).

[a] United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs estimate.

Table 3

A. Universal primary education and gender equality in education

Least developed countries	Net enrolment ratio in primary education, per 100		Ratio of girls to boys enrolled in primary education		Ratio of girls to boys enrolled in secondary education		Ratio of girls to boys enrolled in tertiary education	
	2000	2008	2000	2008	2000	2008	2000	2008
Africa								
Angola	—	—	—	0.8	0.8	—	—	—
Benin	—	93	0.7	0.9	0.5	—	0.3	—
Burkina Faso	36	61	0.7	0.9	0.7	0.7	0.3	0.5
Burundi	43	99	0.8	1.0	—	0.7	0.4	—
Central African Republic	—	66	—	0.7	—	0.6	0.2	0.3
Chad	54	—	0.6	0.7	0.3	—	0.2	0.1
Comoros	73	—	0.9	0.9	0.8	—	0.7	—
Democratic Republic of the Congo	—	—	—	0.8	—	0.6	—	—
Djibouti	27	48	0.7	0.9	0.7	0.7	0.9	—
Equatorial Guinea	69	—	1.0	—	0.6	—	0.4	—
Eritrea	38	40	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.2	—
Ethiopia	41	79	0.6	0.9	0.7	0.7	0.3	0.3
Gambia	73	72	0.9	1.1	0.7	0.9	0.3	—
Guinea	47	72	0.7	0.9	0.4	0.6	—	0.3
Guinea-Bissau	52	—	0.7	—	0.5	—	0.2	—
Lesotho	78	—	1.0	—	1.3	—	1.5	—
Liberia	75	—	0.7	0.9	0.7	0.8	0.7	—
Madagascar	68	—	1.0	1.0	—	0.9	0.9	0.9
Malawi	—	91	1.0	1.0	0.8	0.8	0.4	—
Mali	—	75	0.7	0.8	0.5	0.6	0.5	0.5
Mauritania	63	77	1.0	1.1	0.8	—	—	—
Mozambique	56	80	0.8	0.9	0.6	0.7	—	—
Niger	27	50	0.7	0.8	0.6	0.6	—	0.3
Rwanda	—	96	1.0	1.0	0.9	0.9	0.5	—
Sao Tome and Principe	—	100	—	1.0	—	1.1	[a]	[a]
Senegal	58	75	0.9	1.0	0.7	0.8	—	0.5
Sierra Leone	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Somalia	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sudan	42	—	0.9	0.9	—	0.9	0.9	—
Togo	82	79	0.8	—	0.4	—	—	—

Least developed countries	Net enrolment ratio in primary education, per 100		Ratio of girls to boys enrolled in primary education		Ratio of girls to boys enrolled in secondary education		Ratio of girls to boys enrolled in tertiary education	
	2000	2008	2000	2008	2000	2008	2000	2008
Uganda	—	97	0.9	1.0	0.8	0.9	0.5	0.8
United Republic of Tanzania	53	100	1.0	1.0	—	—	—	—
Zambia	69	97	0.9	1.0	0.8	0.8	0.5	—
Asia								
Afghanistan	—	—	—	0.7	—	—	—	—
Bangladesh	—	85	—	1.1	1.0	—	0.5	—
Bhutan	59	84	0.9	1.0	0.8	0.9	0.5	0.6
Cambodia	88	89	0.9	0.9	0.5	—	0.3	0.5
Lao People's Democratic Republic	79	82	0.9	0.9	0.7	0.8	0.5	0.8
Maldives	99	96	1.0	0.9	1.1	—	[a]	—
Myanmar	—	—	1.0	1.0	1.1	—	—	—
Nepal	74	—	0.8	—	0.7	—	0.4	—
Timor-Leste	—	77	—	0.9	—	—	—	—
Yemen	59	73	0.6	0.8	0.4	—	0.3	—
Pacific								
Kiribati	—	—	1.0	—	1.6	—	[a]	—
Samoa	92	—	1.0	—	1.1	—	0.9	—
Solomon Islands	—	—	0.9	—	0.8	—	[a]	—
Tuvalu	—	—	1.0	—	—	—	[a]	—
Vanuatu	95	—	1.0	—	1.1	—	—	—
Latin America and the Caribbean								
Haiti	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

B. Adult literacy

Least developed countries	Adult literacy (aged 15+) (percentage literate)						Change in gender difference, 1995/04-2005/08 (percentage)	Change in adult literacy, 1995/04-2005/08 (percentage)
	1995/04			2005/08				
	Women	Men	Total	Women	Men	Total		
Africa								
Angola	54	83	67	52	83	70	-3	3
Benin	23	48	35	28	53	41	1	6
Burkina Faso	15	29	22	22	37	29	1	7
Burundi	52	67	59	60	72	66	-3	7
Central African Republic	33	65	49	41	67	55	-6	6
Chad	18	39	28	22	44	33	-1	5
Comoros	67	78	72	70	80	75	-1	3
Democratic Republic of the Congo	54	81	67	56	78	67	-5	0
Djibouti	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Equatorial Guinea	80	93	87	89	97	93	-5	6
Eritrea	40	65	53	55	77	65	-3	12
Ethiopia	23	50	36	23	50	36	0	0
Gambia	—	—	—	34	57	45	—	—
Guinea	18	43	29	26	50	38	-1	9
Guinea-Bissau	—	—	—	37	66	51	—	—
Lesotho	90	74	82	95	83	90	-4	8
Liberia	46	58	52	53	63	58	-3	6
Madagascar	65	77	71	—	—	—	—	—
Malawi	54	75	64	65	77	71	-9	7
Mali	16	33	24	18	35	26	0	2
Mauritania	43	60	51	50	64	57	-2	6
Mozambique	25	55	39	40	70	54	0	15
Niger	9	9	9	15	43	29	28	19
Rwanda	60	71	65	56	75	70	8	5
Sao Tome and Principe	78	92	85	83	93	88	-4	3
Senegal	29	51	39	33	52	42	-3	3
Sierra Leone	24	47	35	29	52	40	1	5
Somalia	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sudan	52	71	61	60	79	69	0	8
Togo	38	69	53	54	77	65	-8	12
Uganda	59	78	68	67	82	75	-5	7
United Republic of Tanzania	62	78	69	66	79	73	-2	4
Zambia	62	81	69	61	81	71	1	1

Least developed countries	Adult literacy (aged 15+) (percentage literate)						Change in gender difference, 1995/04-2005/08 (percentage)	Change in adult literacy, 1995/04-2005/08 (percentage)
	1995/04			2005/08				
	Women	Men	Total	Women	Men	Total		
Asia								
Afghanistan	13	43	28	—	—	—	—	—
Bangladesh	41	54	47	50	60	55	-3	8
Bhutan	—	—	—	39	65	53	—	—
Cambodia	64	85	74	71	85	78	-7	4
Lao People's Democratic Republic	61	77	69	63	82	73	3	4
Maldives	96	96	96	98	98	98	0	2
Myanmar	86	94	90	89	95	92	-2	2
Nepal	35	63	49	44	70	57	-1	8
Timor-Leste	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Yemen	35	73	54	43	79	61	-3	7
Pacific								
Kiribati	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Samoa	98	99	99	98	99	99	0	0
Solomon Islands	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tuvalu	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Vanuatu	73	78	75	80	83	81	-1	6
Latin America and the Caribbean								
Haiti	53	57	55	64	60	62	-7	7
Least developed countries	**44**	**64**	**54**	**50**	**67**	**58**	**-3**	**4**

Sources: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2010, *Reaching the marginalized* (Paris, 2010), annex, tables 5, 8, 9A and 12, and updated data provided on 17 March 2010 by the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (Montreal).

Note: Components may not add to totals owing to rounding.

Table 4
Infant and child health

	Under-5 mortality rate (per 1,000)				*Infant mortality rate (per 1,000)*				*1-year-old children immunized (percentage)*		*Children under 6 months exclusively breastfed (percentage)*	*Moderately/ severely underweight children under 5 (percentage)*
	1990	*2000*	*2008*	*1990-2008*	*1990*	*2000*	*2008*	*1990-2008*	*Measles 2008*	*DTP3 2008*	*2003/08*	*2003/08*
Africa												
Angola	260	239	220	-40	154	141	130	-24	79	81	11	16
Benin	184	144	121	-63	111	89	76	-35	61	67	43	23
Burkina Faso	201	188	169	-32	110	102	92	-18	75	79	7	32
Burundi	189	178	168	-21	113	107	102	-11	84	92	45	39
Central African Republic	178	181	173	-5	116	119	115	-1	62	54	23	29
Chad	201	205	209	8	120	122	124	4	23	20	2	37
Comoros	128	114	105	-23	90	81	75	-15	76	81	21	25
Democratic Republic of the Congo	199	199	199	0	126	126	126	0	67	69	36	14
Djibouti	123	106	95	-28	95	84	76	-19	73	89	1	33
Equatorial Guinea	198	168	148	-50	120	102	90	-30	51	33	24	19
Eritrea	150	89	58	-92	92	58	41	-51	95	97	52	40
Ethiopia	210	148	109	-101	124	91	69	-55	74	81	49	38
Gambia	153	131	106	-47	104	93	80	-24	91	96	41	20
Guinea	231	185	146	-85	137	111	90	-47	64	66	48	26
Guinea-Bissau	240	218	195	-45	142	129	117	-25	76	63	16	19
Lesotho	101	109	79	-22	80	83	63	-17	85	83	36	20
Liberia	219	174	145	-74	146	118	100	-46	64	64	29	24
Madagascar	167	132	106	-61	101	83	68	-33	81	82	67	42
Malawi	225	162	100	-125	133	100	65	-68	88	91	57	21
Mali	250	217	194	-56	139	120	103	-36	68	68	38	32
Mauritania	129	122	118	-11	81	77	75	-6	65	74	16	31
Mozambique	249	183	130	-119	166	124	90	-76	77	72	37	18
Niger	305	227	167	-138	144	107	79	-65	80	66	4	43
Rwanda	174	186	112	-62	106	112	72	-34	92	97	88	23
Sao Tome and Principe	101	99	98	-3	65	64	64	-1	93	99	60	9
Senegal	149	131	108	-41	72	66	57	-15	77	88	34	17
Sierra Leone	278	252	194	-84	163	151	123	-40	60	60	11	30
Somalia	200	200	200	0	119	119	119	0	24	31	9	36
Sudan	124	115	109	-15	78	73	70	-8	79	86	34	31
Togo	150	122	98	-52	89	76	64	-25	77	89	48	21
Uganda	186	158	135	-51	114	98	85	-29	68	64	60	20

	Under-5 mortality rate (per 1,000)			1990-2008	Infant mortality rate (per 1,000)			1990-2008	1-year-old children immunized (percentage)		Children under 6 months exclusively breastfed (percentage)	Moderately/severely underweight children under 5 (percentage)
	1990	2000	2008		1990	2000	2008		Measles 2008	DTP3 2008	2003/08	2003/08
United Republic of Tanzania	157	139	104	-53	97	87	67	-30	88	84	41	22
Zambia	172	169	148	-24	105	104	92	-13	85	80	61	19
Asia												
Afghanistan	260	257	257	-3	168	165	165	-3	75	85	—	39
Bangladesh	149	91	54	-95	103	67	43	-60	89	95	43	46
Bhutan	148	106	81	-67	91	68	54	-37	99	96	—	19
Cambodia	117	106	90	-27	85	80	69	-16	89	91	60	36
Lao People's Democratic Republic	157	86	61	-96	108	64	48	-60	52	61	26	37
Maldives	111	55	28	-83	79	43	24	-55	97	98	10	30
Myanmar	120	107	98	-22	85	77	71	-14	82	85	15	32
Nepal	142	85	51	-91	99	63	41	-58	79	82	53	45
Timor-Leste	184	129	93	-91	138	100	75	-63	73	79	31	49
Yemen	127	98	69	-58	90	71	53	-37	62	69	12	46
Pacific												
Kiribati	89	63	48	-41	65	49	38	-27	72	82	80	13
Samoa	50	34	26	-24	40	28	22	-18	45	46	—	—
Solomon Islands	38	37	36	-2	31	30	30	-1	60	78	74	21
Tuvalu	53	42	36	-17	42	35	30	-12	93	99	35	—
Vanuatu	27	29	33	6	23	25	27	4	65	76	40	—
Latin America and the Caribbean												
Haiti	151	109	72	-79	105	78	54	-51	58	53	41	22
Least developed countries	**179**	**150**	**129**	**-50**	**113**	**95**	**82**	**-31**	**76**	**78**	**39**	**33**

Source: United Nations Children's Fund, *State of the World's Children Special Edition, Statistical Tables* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.10.XX.2), tables 1-3.

Table 5
Reproductive health and health services

Least developed countries	*Skilled health personnel at birth (percentage of births)*		*Women with antenatal visit to skilled practitioner (percentage)*		*Maternal mortality ratio (per 100,000)*		*Contraceptive use, currently married women aged 15-49, any method (percentage)*	
	1995/02	*2003/08*	*1995/02*	*2003/08*	*2003/08 reported*	*2005 adjusted*	*1994/00*	*2001/09*
Africa								
Angola	45	47	66	80	—	1 400	8.1	6.2
Benin	66	74	81	84	400	840	16.4	17.0
Burkina Faso	31	54	61	85	480	700	11.9	17.4
Burundi	25	34	78	92	620	1 100	15.7	9.1
Central African Republic	44	53	62	69	540	980	14.8	19.0
Chad	16	14	42	39	1 100	1 500	4.1	2.8
Comoros	62	62	74	75	380	400	21.0	25.7
Democratic Republic of the Congo	61	74	68	85	550	1 100	31.4	20.6
Djibouti	—	61	67	92	550	650	9.0	17.8
Equatorial Guinea	65	65	86	86	—	680	10.1	—
Eritrea	28	28	70	70	1 000	450	8.0	8.0
Ethiopia	6	6	27	28	670	720	3.3	11.4
Gambia	55	57	91	98	730	690	—	17.5
Guinea	35	46	71	88	980	910	6.2	9.1
Guinea-Bissau	35	39	62	78	410	1 100	7.6	10.3
Lesotho	60	55	85	90	760	960	30.4	37.3
Liberia	51	46	84	79	990	1 200	—	16.4
Madagascar	46	51	71	80	470	510	19.4	39.9
Malawi	56	54	91	92	810	1 100	21.9	31.0
Mali	41	49	57	70	460	970	6.7	8.2
Mauritania	57	61	64	75	690	820	8.0	9.3
Mozambique	44	55	76	89	410	520	5.6	16.5
Niger	16	33	41	46	650	1 800	8.2	11.2
Rwanda	31	52	92	96	750	1 300	13.7	36.4
Sao Tome and Principe	79	81	91	97	150	—	—	29.3
Senegal	58	52	79	87	400	980	12.9	11.8
Sierra Leone	42	43	68	81	860	2 100	4.3	8.2
Somalia	34	33	32	26	1 000	1 400	7.9	14.6
Sudan	87	49	60	64	1 100	450	7.0	7.6
Togo	49	62	73	84	480	510	23.5	16.8
Uganda	39	42	92	94	440	550	14.8	23.7
United Republic of Tanzania	36	43	49	76	580	950	20.4	26.4
Zambia	47	47	83	94	590	830	25.9	40.8

Least developed countries	Skilled health personnel at birth (percentage of births)		Women with antenatal visit to skilled practitioner (percentage)		Maternal mortality ratio (per 100,000)		Contraceptive use, currently married women aged 15-49, any method (percentage)	
	1995/02	2003/08	1995/02	2003/08	2003/08 reported	2005 adjusted	1994/00	2001/09
Asia								
Afghanistan	12	14	37	16	1 600	1 800	4.9	18.6
Bangladesh	12	18	33	51	350	570	49.2	55.8
Bhutan	24	71	51	88	260	440	18.8	30.7
Cambodia	32	44	38	69	470	540	14.5	40.0
Lao People's Democratic Republic	19	20	27	35	410	660	18.6	32.2
Maldives	70	84	81	81	140	120	42.0	39.0
Myanmar	57	57	76	76	320	380	32.7	37.0
Nepal	11	19	28	44	280	830	28.5	48.0
Timor-Leste	26	18	43	61	—	380	22.6	10.0
Yemen	21	36	34	47	370	430	20.8	27.7
Pacific								
Kiribati	85	63	—	88	56	—	36.1	—
Samoa	100	100	—	—	29	—	24.5	—
Solomon Islands	85	70	—	74	140	220	—	34.6
Tuvalu	99	98	—	97	—	—	—	30.5
Vanuatu	88	74	—	84	150	—	39.0	—
Latin America and the Caribbean								
Haiti	24	26	79	85	630	670	48.0	32.0
Least developed countries	—	**38**	—	**64**	—	**870**	—	**30.0**

Sources: United Nations Population Division, *World Contraceptive Use 2009* (New York, 2009); United Nations Children's Fund, *State of the World's Children Special Edition, Statistical Tables* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.10.XX.2), table 8.

Table 6
HIV/AIDS prevalence and prevention

Least developed countries	HIV prevalence rate, adults aged 15-49		Condom use at last high-risk sex (percentage)				Condom use rate of contraceptive prevalence (percentage)		Population aged 15-24 with comprehensive correct knowledge of HIV/AIDS (percentage)		AIDS orphans (one or both parents died) (thousands)	Ratio of school attendance of orphans to that of non-orphans
			1995/01		2003/08				2003/08			
	2005	2007	Women	Men	Women	Men	1995/00	2003/08	Women	Men	2007	2003/08
Africa												
Angola	1.6	2.1	—	—	—	—	4	5	—	—	50	—
Benin	1.3	1.2	9	34	28	45	4	7	16	35	29	90
Burkina Faso	2.1	1.6	41	55	64	—	10	8	19	—	100	61
Burundi	3.5	2.0	—	—	25	—	1	3	30	—	120	85
Central African Republic	6.4	6.3	—	—	41	—	7	18	17	27	72	96
Chad	3.4	3.5	—	—	17	25	5	14	8	20	85	105
Comoros	<0.1	<0.1	—	—	—	—	3	—	—	—	<0.1	—
Democratic Republic of the Congo	—	—	—	—	16	36	7	17	15	21	—	77
Djibouti	3.1	3.1	—	—	26	51	—	1	18	—	5.2	—
Equatorial Guinea	3.7	3.4	—	—	—	—	4	—	—	—	4.8	—
Eritrea	1.2	1.3	—	—	—	—	4	8	—	—	18	—
Ethiopia	2.4	2.1	17	30	28	50	4	1	20	33	650	90
Gambia	0.9	0.9	—	—	54		3	—	39	—	2.7	87
Guinea	1.2	1.6	17	32	26	37	10	12	17	23	25	73
Guinea-Bissau	1.8	1.8	—	—	39	—	1	7	18	—	5.9	97
Lesotho	23.9	23.2	—	—	50	48	6	13	26	18	110	95
Liberia	1.4	1.7	—	—	14	22	—	14	21	27	15	85
Madagascar	0.1	0.1	—	—	5	12	4	3	19	16	3.4	75
Malawi	13.3	11.9	32	38	40	58	7	4	42	42	550	97
Mali	1.5	1.5	14	31	17	36	6	5	18	22	44	87
Mauritania	0.7	0.8	—	—	—	—	2	4	5	14	3	66
Mozambique	10.3	12.5	—	—	44	—	5	7	14	—	400	89
Niger	0.7	0.8	7	30	18y	37	<0.5	<0.5	13	16	25	67
Rwanda	4.3	2.8	23	55	26	40	2	5	51	54	220	82
Sao Tome and Principe	—	—	—	—	56	—	<0.5	—	44	—	—	—
Senegal	0.4	1.0	—	—	36	52	5	13	19	24	8.4	83
Sierra Leone	1.3	1.7	—	—	10	22	2	7	17	—	16	83
Somalia	0.5	0.5	—	—	—	—	<0.5	<0.5	4	—	8.8	78
Sudan	1.4	1.4	—	—	—	—	<0.5	4	—	—	—	—
Togo	3.6	3.3	22	41	50	—	6	23	15	—	68	94

Least developed countries	HIV prevalence rate, adults aged 15-49		Condom use at last high-risk sex (percentage)				Condom use rate of contraceptive prevalence (percentage)		Population aged 15-24 with comprehensive correct knowledge of HIV/AIDS (percentage)		AIDS orphans (one or both parents died) (thousands)	Ratio of school attendance of orphans to that of non-orphans
			1995/01		2003/08				2003/08			
	2005	2007	Women	Men	Women	Men	1995/00	2003/08	Women	Men	2007	2003/08
Uganda	7.9	5.4	25	42	38	55	5	7	32	38	1 200	96
United Republic of Tanzania	7.0	6.2	18	31	46	9	4	8	39	42	970	97
Zambia	15.4	15.2	20	39	38	48	14	12	34	37	600	93
Asia												
Afghanistan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	12	—	—	—	—
Bangladesh	—	—	—	—	—	—	8	8	8	18	—	84
Bhutan	—	0.1	—	—	—	—	4	—	—	—	—	—
Cambodia	1.5	0.8	—	—	—	84	2	7	50	45	—	83
Lao People's Democratic Republic	<0.1	0.2	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—
Maldives	—	—	—	—	—	—	14	23	—	—	—	—
Myanmar	0.9	0.7	—	—	—	—	<0.5	1	—	—	—	—
Nepal	0.5	0.5	—	—	—	78	7	10	28	44	—	—
Timor-Leste	—	—	—	—	—	—	13	—	—	—	—	—
Yemen	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	2	—	—	—
Pacific												
Kiribati	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—
Samoa	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	—	—	—	—	—
Solomon Islands	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	—	—	—	—
Tuvalu	—	—	—	—	—	44	—	—	—	—	—	—
Vanuatu	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	15	—	—	—
Latin America and the Caribbean												
Haiti	2.2	2.2	19	30	29	43	10	17	34	40	—	86
Least developed countries	2	2			30	46	—	—	19	28	—	86

Sources: UNAIDS, *2008 Report on the global AIDS epidemic* (Geneva, 2008); United Nations Children's Fund, *The State of the World's Children Special Edition, Statistical Tables* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.10.XX.2), table 4; and United Nations Population Division, *World Contraceptive Use 2009* (New York, 2009) (www.un.org/esa/population/publications/WCU2009/Main.html, accessed on 23 February 2010).

Table 7
Malaria and tuberculosis prevalence, mortality, prevention and treatment

	Malaria							Tuberculosis								
				Children under 5 years									Stop Tuberculosis Strategy			
	High-burden country	Estimated cases per 1,000 population	Estimated deaths per 100,000 population	Use of treated bed nets (percentage)		With fever using anti-malarial drugs (percentage)		High-burden country	Estimated cases per 100,000 population		Estimated deaths per 100,000 population		Case detection rate (percentage)		Treatment success (percentage)	
Least developed countries	2009	2006	2006	2000/04	2005/08	2000/04	2005/08	2009	2000	2007	2000	2007	2000	2008	2000	2007
Africa																
Angola	x	215	128	—	18	—	29		530	294	57	22		80		18
Benin		370	146	7	20	60	54		128	135	12	12		—		—
Burkina Faso	x	434	178	2	10	50	48		338	403	34	41		11		73
Burundi		278	94	1	8	31	30		455	647	46	68		20		83
Central African Republic		369	100	2	15	69	57		485	425	47	38				
Chad	x	399	173	1	—	32	—		420	497	43	51		18		54
Comoros		251	36	9	—	63	—		112	83	8	6		—		—
Democratic Republic of the Congo	x	389	158	1	6	52	30	x	592	659	65	77	35	43	78	87
Djibouti		47	14		1		10		761	1 104	70	91		45		78
Equatorial Guinea		390	220	1	—	49	—		274	469	22	48		—		—
Eritrea		4	2	4	—	4	—		114	134	12	13		76		90
Ethiopia	x	153	51	2	33	3	10	x	486	564	53	64	42	47	80	84
Gambia		282	106	15	49	55	63		491	404	53	43		42		58
Guinea		410	164		1		44		332	448	35	46		34		75
Guinea-Bissau		367	180	7	39	58	46		273	319	30	30		—		—
Lesotho		—	—	—	—	—	—		356	568	16	37		17		66
Liberia		408	171	—	—	—	59		435	398	46	41		—		—
Madagascar	x	34	12	0	—	—	34		359	417	39	45		42		78
Malawi	x	334	95	3	25	27	25		362	305	23	21		49		78
Mali	x	361	201	—	27	—	32		571	599	61	63		13		76
Mauritania		184	85	—	—	33	21		619	559	67	60		28		41
Mozambique	x	354	92	—	23	15	37	x	499	470	47	36	31	42	75	79

Least developed countries	Malaria							Tuberculosis								
				Children under 5 years									Stop Tuberculosis Strategy			
	High-burden country	Estimated cases per 1,000 population	Estimated deaths per 100,000 population	Use of treated bed nets (percentage)		With fever using anti-malarial drugs (percentage)		High-burden country	Estimated cases per 100,000 population		Estimated deaths per 100,000 population		Case detection rate (percentage)		Treatment success (percentage)	
	2009	2006	2006	2000/04	2005/08	2000/04	2005/08	2009	2000	2007	2000	2007	2000	2008	2000	2007
Niger	x	419	229	1	7	48	33		278	292	30	31		35		77
Rwanda		344	59	5	56	13	6		442	590	39	57		19		86
Sao Tome and Principe		67	19	23	42	61	25		272	240	30	26		—		—
Senegal	x	121	80	2	29	36	9		420	468	45	49		29		76
Sierra Leone		396	154	2	26	61	52		675	941	71	98		27		87
Somalia		72	41	—	11	—	8		414	352	67	55		49		89
Sudan	x	133	85	—	28	—	54		375	402	53	59		29		82
Togo		325	113	—	38	60	48		656	750	66	76		8		67
Uganda	x	355	145	—	10	—	61	x	364	343	30	27	37	43	63	75
United Republic of Tanzania	x	292	98	—	26	58	57	x	391	129	34	13	67	75	78	88
Zambia	x	313	121	7	41	52	43		658	387	47	25		74		85
Asia																
Afghanistan		22	0	—	—	—	—	x	346	271	41	34	18	55	88	87
Bangladesh	x	19	4	—	—	—	—	x	500	412	58	50	24	42	81	92
Bhutan		24	3	—	—	—	—		515	363	60	43		59		89
Cambodia	x	18	4	—	4	—	—	x	758	680	83	79	28	55	91	94
Lao People's Democratic Republic		4	1	18	41	9	8		344	289	27	22		43		92
Maldives		—	—	—	—	—	—		96	48	7	4		88		91
Myanmar	x	87	19	—	—	—	—	x	267	466	32	60	16	62	82	89
Nepal		1	0	—	—	—	—		312	240	28	22		63		88
Timor-Leste		475	93	8	—	47	—		644	378	70	47		87		79
Yemen		12	4	—	—	—	—		164	130	12	10		30		83

Least developed countries	Malaria							Tuberculosis								
				Children under 5 years									Stop Tuberculosis Strategy			
	High-burden country	Estimated cases per 1,000 population	Estimated deaths per 100,000 population	Use of treated bed nets (percentage)		With fever using anti-malarial drugs (percentage)		High-burden country	Estimated cases per 100,000 population		Estimated deaths per 100,000 population		Case detection rate (percentage)		Treatment success (percentage)	
	2009	2006	2006	2000/04	2005/08	2000/04	2005/08	2009	2000	2007	2000	2007	2000	2008	2000	2007
Pacific																
Kiribati		—	—	—	—	—	—		546	423	62	49		95		90
Samoa		—	—	—	—	—	—		27	25	3	3		—		—
Solomon Islands		218	30	—	—	—	—		300	180	33	21		61		90
Tuvalu		—	—	—	—	—	—		422	203	40	17		97		75
Vanuatu		134	14	—	—	—	—		143	102	16	12		70		90
Latin America and the Caribbean																
Haiti		17	8	—	—	12	—		403	366	53	47		45		82

Sources: World Health Organization, *World Malaria Report 2009* (Geneva, 2009); http://www.who.int/hiv/pub/epidemiology/pubfacts/en/; *Global Tuberculosis Control 2009: Epidemiology; Strategy; Financing* (Geneva, 2009); United Nations Children's Fund, *The State of the World's Children Special Edition, Statistical Tables* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.10.XX.2), table 3.

Table 8
Improved water and sanitation

	Percentage of population with improved access to drinking water				*Percentage of population with improved access to sanitation*				*Annual population growth 2005-2010 (percentage)*	
	Urban		*Rural*		*Urban*		*Rural*			
Least developed countries	*2000*	*2008*	*2000*	*2008*	*2000*	*2008*	*2000*	*2008*	*Urban*	*Rural*
Africa										
Angola	43	60	40	38	70	86	11	18	4.3	0.6
Benin	78	84	59	69	19	24	3	4	4.1	2.5
Burkina Faso	85	95	55	72	31	33	4	6	6.9	2.3
Burundi	89	83	70	71	46	49	45	46	5.8	2.5
Central African Republic	85	92	49	51	32	43	16	28	2.3	1.6
Chad	60	67	41	44	22	23	3	4	4.6	2.1
Comoros	93	91	92	97	42	50	23	30	2.5	2.2
Democratic Republic of the Congo	85	80	27	28	23	23	13	23	4.6	1.8
Djibouti	88	98	61	52	69	63	30	10	1.8	1.6
Equatorial Guinea	45	—	42	—	60	—	46	—	3.0	2.3
Eritrea	70	74	50	57	54	52	2	4	5.2	2.6
Ethiopia	88	98	18	26	26	29	5	8	3.5	2.4
Gambia	91	96	77	86	65	68	61	65	4.3	0.8
Guinea	88	89	51	61	27	34	9	11	3.6	1.5
Guinea-Bissau	79	83	45	51	43	49	7	9	2.5	2.1
Lesotho	92	97	69	81	35	40	28	25	3.8	-0.1
Liberia	82	79	44	51	23	25	4	4	4.9	3.5
Madagascar	73	71	24	29	15	15	8	10	3.8	2.2
Malawi	93	95	58	77	51	51	50	57	5.4	2.2
Mali	69	81	34	44	41	45	28	32	4.7	1.2
Mauritania	45	52	37	47	38	50	9	9	2.9	2.0
Mozambique	75	77	27	29	37	38	4	4	4.5	1.1
Niger	78	96	35	39	27	34	3	4	4.4	3.7
Rwanda	85	77	64	62	43	50	40	55	4.1	2.3
Sao Tome and Principe	86	89	70	88	27	30	15	19	3.0	-0.5
Senegal	90	92	48	52	66	69	31	38	3.2	2.2
Sierra Leone	75	86	44	26	21	24	5	6	3.5	2.2
Somalia	36	67	17	9	45	52	10	6	3.5	1.6
Sudan	73	64	55	52	58	55	20	18	4.1	1.0
Togo	83	87	39	41	24	24	5	3	4.1	1.3
Uganda	85	91	53	64	37	38	45	49	4.4	3.1
United Republic of Tanzania	86	80	45	45	29	32	22	21	4.6	2.3
Zambia	88	87	36	46	60	59	40	43	2.8	2.2
Subtotal Africa	**77**	**80**	**38**	**43**	**38**	**41**	**17**	**21**	—	—

Least developed countries	Percentage of population with improved access to drinking water				Percentage of population with improved access to sanitation				Annual population growth 2005-2010 (percentage)	
	Urban		Rural		Urban		Rural			
	2000	2008	2000	2008	2000	2008	2000	2008	Urban	Rural
Asia										
Afghanistan	36	78	17	39	46	60	28	30	4.6	3.1
Bangladesh	86	85	77	78	57	56	43	52	3.2	0.8
Bhutan	99	99	88	88	87	87	54	54	4.0	0.6
Cambodia	64	81	42	56	50	67	10	18	3.0	1.3
Lao People's Democratic Republic	77	72	40	51	62	86	16	38	5.6	0.1
Maldives	100	99	87	86	100	100	74	96	4.9	-0.6
Myanmar	80	75	60	69	81	86	59	79	2.9	-0.1
Nepal	94	93	81	87	47	51	19	27	5.0	1.2
Timor-Leste	69	86	47	63	55	76	25	40	4.8	2.8
Yemen	82	72	59	57	81	94	21	33	4.8	2.0
Subtotal Asia	**80**	**82**	**66**	**71**	**63**	**66**	**38**	**48**	—	—
Latin America and the Caribbean										
Haiti	67	71	49	55	34	24	15	10	4.9	-1.5
Pacific										
Kiribati	77	—	50	—	47	—	22	—	1.7	1.5
Samoa	92	—	88	—	100	100	100	100	-1.0	0.2
Solomon Islands	94	—	65	—	98	98	18	—	4.2	2.1
Tuvalu	95	98	93	97	87	88	79	81	1.4	-0.5
Vanuatu	93	96	66	79	57	66	36	48	4.3	2.0
Subtotal Pacific	**90**	—	**69**	—	**79**	**88**	**39**	—	—	—
Total least developed countries	**78**	**80**	**50**	**54**	**47**	**50**	**26**	**31**	**4.0**	**1.6**

Source: World Health Organization and United Nations Children's Fund, *Progress on Sanitation and Drinking-Water — 2010 Update* (Geneva and New York, 2010); United Nations Population Division, *World Urbanization Prospects: The 2009 Revision* (http://esa.un.org/unpd/wup/index.htm, accessed on 5 April 2010).

Table 9
Communications

Least developed countries	Permanent and mobile post offices per 100,000 population		Telephone lines and mobile cellular subscribers per 100 population							Internet users per 100 population	
			Fixed lines			Mobile cellular		Total			
	2000	2008	2000	2004	2008	2004	2008	2004	2008	2004	2008
Africa											
Angola	0.4	0.7	0.5	0.6	0.6	4.6	37.6	5.2	38.2	0.5	3.1
Benin	2.4	1.8	0.8	1.0	1.2	6.0	41.9	7.0	43.0	1.2	1.9
Burkina Faso	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.6	1.0	3.0	16.8	3.6	17.7	0.4	0.9
Burundi	0.4	0.6	0.3	0.4	0.4	1.4	6.0	1.8	6.3	0.3	0.8
Central African Republic	0.9	—	0.3	0.3	0.3	1.5	3.6	1.7	3.8	0.2	0.4
Chad	0.5	—	0.1	0.1	0.1	1.3	16.6	1.4	16.7	0.4	1.2
Comoros	3.9	3.4	1.0	2.5	3.5	1.4	14.9	3.9	18.4	1.3	3.5
Democratic Republic of the Congo	1.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	3.5	14.4	3.5	14.5	0.2	0.5
Djibouti	—	1.3	1.5	1.4	1.8	4.4	13.3	5.8	15.1	0.8	2.3
Equatorial Guinea	—	—	1.4	1.8	1.5	10.5	52.5	12.3	54.0	0.8	1.8
Eritrea	1.6	1.4	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.5	2.2	1.4	3.0	1.2	4.1
Ethiopia	0.8	1.3	0.4	0.7	1.1	0.2	2.4	0.9	3.5	0.2	0.5
Gambia	—	1.6	2.7	2.9	2.9	11.8	70.2	14.7	73.2	3.3	6.9
Guinea	0.7	—	0.3	0.3	0.2	1.7	39.1	2.0	39.3	0.5	0.9
Guinea-Bissau	2.2	0.8	0.9	0.7	0.3	2.7	31.8	3.4	32.0	1.8	2.4
Lesotho	8.2	—	1.2	1.9	3.2	9.9	28.4	11.8	31.5	2.2	3.6
Liberia	0.6	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.1	2.9	19.3	3.2	19.4	<0.1	0.5
Madagascar	7.2	3.6	0.3	0.3	0.9	1.9	25.3	2.3	26.2	0.5	1.7
Malawi	2.8	2.3	0.5	0.7	1.2	1.7	12.0	2.4	13.2	0.4	2.1
Mali	—	—	0.4	0.6	0.6	3.5	27.1	4.1	27.7	0.4	1.6
Mauritania	—	—	0.7	1.3	2.4	18.0	65.1	19.3	67.4	0.5	1.9
Mozambique	2.0	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.4	3.5	19.7	3.8	20.0	0.7	1.6
Niger	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.4	1.4	12.9	1.6	13.4	0.2	0.5
Rwanda	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.2	1.6	13.6	1.8	13.8	0.4	3.1
Sao Tome and Principe	—	—	3.3	4.7	4.8	5.1	30.6	9.8	35.4	13.3	15.5
Senegal	1.3	1.3	2.2	2.2	2.0	10.2	44.1	12.4	46.1	4.4	8.4
Sierra Leone	1.5	0.9	0.4	0.5	0.6	2.3	18.1	2.8	18.7	0.2	0.3
Somalia	—	—	0.4	1.2	1.1	6.1	7.0	7.3	8.1	1.1	1.1
Sudan	1.0	—	1.2	2.7	0.9	2.8	29.0	5.5	29.9	0.8	10.2
Togo	0.9	0.9	0.9	1.1	2.2	5.7	24.0	6.8	26.2	3.8	5.4
Uganda	1.3	1.1	0.3	0.3	0.5	4.2	27.0	4.5	27.6	0.7	7.9
United Republic of Tanzania	1.3	0.8	0.5	0.4	0.3	5.1	30.6	5.5	30.9	0.9	1.2
Zambia	2.2	3.4	0.8	0.8	0.7	4.0	28.0	4.8	28.8	0.7	5.6
Subtotal Africa	**1.3**	**0.9**	**0.5**	**0.7**	**0.8**	**3.2**	**20.1**	**3.9**	**20.9**	**0.7**	**2.7**

Least developed countries	Permanent and mobile post offices per 100,000 population		Telephone lines and mobile cellular subscribers per 100 population							Internet users per 100 population	
			Fixed lines			Mobile cellular		Total			
	2000	2008	2000	2004	2008	2004	2008	2004	2008	2004	2008
Asia											
Afghanistan	1.9	—	0.1	0.2	0.4	2.5	29.0	2.7	29.4	0.1	1.8
Bangladesh	—	6.1	0.4	0.6	0.8	1.8	27.9	2.4	28.7	0.2	0.4
Bhutan	—	13.5	2.2	4.8	4.0	3.0	36.6	7.8	40.6	3.2	6.6
Cambodia	1.1	0.6	0.2	0.2	0.3	6.3	29.1	6.6	29.4	0.3	0.5
Lao People's Democratic Republic	3.2	5.7	0.8	1.3	2.1	3.5	32.6	4.8	34.7	0.4	8.5
Maldives	74.0	—	9.1	10.9	15.4	39.0	142.8	50.0	158.2	6.6	23.5
Myanmar	2.8	2.8	0.5	0.9	1.6	0.2	0.7	1.1	2.4	<0.1	0.2
Nepal	16.4	—	1.2	1.6	2.8	0.4	14.6	2.0	17.4	0.5	1.7
Timor-Leste	—	—	—	0.2	0.2	2.7	9.2	2.9	9.4	—	0.2
Yemen	1.5	2.8	1.9	3.9	4.9	7.3	16.1	11.1	21.0	0.9	1.6
Subtotal Asia	**2.4**	**4.0**	**0.6**	**0.9**	**1.4**	**2.2**	**21.8**	**3.1**	**23.2**	**0.3**	**0.9**
Pacific											
Kiribati	—	25.8	4.0	4.8	4.1	0.7	1.0	5.4	5.2	2.2	2.1
Samoa	19.8	—	4.9	9.2	16.1	8.9	69.3	18.1	85.4	3.1	5.0
Solomon Islands	33.5	32.1	1.8	1.5	1.6	0.7	5.9	2.2	7.4	0.7	2.0
Tuvalu	—	—	7.0	7.7	15.2	5.1	20.2	12.8	35.4	20.6	43.0
Vanuatu	4.7	—	3.5	3.2	4.5	5.0	15.4	8.2	19.8	4.8	7.3
Subtotal Pacific	**20.9**	**18.1**	**3.1**	**3.8**	**5.2**	**3.3**	**18.9**	**7.0**	**24.1**	**2.4**	**4.1**
Latin America and the Caribbean											
Haiti	1.0	—	0.9	1.5	1.1	4.3	32.4	5.8	33.5	5.4	10.1
Total least developed countries	**1.8**	**2.1**	**0.5**	**0.8**	**1.0**	**2.8**	**20.9**	**3.6**	**21.9**	**0.6**	**2.1**

Source: Universal Postal Union, postal statistics database (http://www.upu.org, accessed on 21 April 2009); International Telecommunication Union, information and communications technology statistics database (http://www.itu.int/ITU-D/icteye/Default.aspx, accessed on 3 March 2010).

Table 10
Transportation

	Roads				*Railways*			*Air transport*			
	Total roads (km)		*Paved roads (percentage)*		*Route (km)*	*Freight (millions of ton-km)*		*Departures (thousands)*		*Air freight (millions of ton-km)*	
Least developed countries	*2000/02*	*2003/08*	*2000/02*	*2003/08*	*2000/08*	*2000/05*	*2006/08*	*2000*	*2008*	*2000*	*2008*
Africa											
Angola	51 429	—	10	—	—	—	—	4	3	61	71
Benin	—	19 000	—	10	758	—	36	2	—	12	—
Burkina Faso	—	92 495	—	4	622	—	—	3	17	12	—
Burundi	14 480	12 322	7	10	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Central African Republic	24 307	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Chad	33 400	40 000	1	—	—	—	—	2	—	12	—
Comoros	880	—	77	—	—	—	—	2	—	12	—
Democratic Republic of the Congo	157 000	153 497	—	2	4 007	513	352	—	—	—	—
Djibouti	3 065	—	45	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Equatorial Guinea	2 880	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Eritrea	4 010	—	22	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ethiopia	29 571	42 429	12	13	—	—	—	27	40	78	228
Gambia	2 700	3 742	35	19	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Guinea	30 500	44 348	—	10	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Guinea-Bissau	3 455	—	28	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lesotho	5 940	—	18	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Liberia	10 600	—	6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Madagascar	49 827	—	12	—	854	—	1	20.5	21	12	12
Malawi	—	15 451	—	45	797	87	33	5	5	4	2
Mali	15 100	18 709	12	18	—	—	—	1.5	2	—	—
Mauritania	7 660	11 066	11	27	728	—	7 622	4	1	13	—
Mozambique	30 400	—	19	—	3 116	—	695	7	11	7	7
Niger	14 658	18 951	26	21	—	—	—	2	—	12	—
Rwanda	12 000	14 008	8	19	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sao Tome and Principe	320	—	68	—	—	—	—	1	—	<0.1	—
Senegal	14 583	13 576	29	29	2 758	371	1 748	2	—	12	—
Sierra Leone	11 330	—	8	—	—	—	—	0.2	—	9	10
Somalia	22 100	—	12	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sudan	11 900	—	36	—	4 578	1 164	766	8	7	37	47
Togo	7 520	—	32	—	—	—	—	2	—	12	—
Uganda	—	70 746	—	23	—	—	—	0.3	—	21	34
United Republic of Tanzania	88 200	78 891	4	9	2 600	1 990	728	6	5	3	1
Zambia	66 781	—	22	—	—	—	—	6	4	—	—

	Roads				Railways			Air transport			
	Total roads (km)		Paved roads (percentage)		Route (km)	Freight (millions of ton-km)		Departures (thousands)		Air freight (millions of ton-km)	
Least developed countries	*2000-02*	*2003-08*	*2000-02*	*2003-08*	*2000-08*	*2000-05*	*2006-08*	*2000*	*2008*	*2000*	*2008*
Asia											
Afghanistan	21 000	42 150	13	29	—	—	—	3	—	8	—
Bangladesh	207 485	239 226	10	10	2 835	777	870	6	1	194	89
Bhutan	—	8 050	—	62	—	—	—	1	—	—	—
Cambodia	—	38 257	—	6	—	—	—	—	4	—	1
Lao People's Democratic Republic	21 716	29 811	13	13	—	—	—	6	10	2	3
Maldives	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	—	1	—
Myanmar	27 966	27 000	11	12	—	—	885	10	30	1	3
Nepal	13 223	17 280	31	57	—	—	—	12	7	17	7
Timor-Leste	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Yemen	65 144	71 300	16	9	—	—	—	15	14	32	33
Pacific											
Kiribati	670	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Samoa	—	—	14	—	—	—	—	11	—	2	2
Solomon Islands	1 391	—	2	—	—	—	—	12	—	1	1
Tuvalu	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Vanuatu	1 070	—	24	—	—	—	—	1	—	2	2
Latin America and the Caribbean											
Haiti	4 160	—	24	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Sources: World Bank, *World Development Indicators 10* (Washington, D.C., 2010). Additional data provided by the World Bank from its World Development Indicators database, 20 February 2010. Compiled from data of the International Road Federation, the World Bank and the International Civil Aviation Organization.

Table 11

Official development assistance to least developed countries, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development/Development Assistance Committee donors and Aid for Trade

A. Official development assistance

	Net donor disbursements[a]								
	1997-1998			*2007*			*2008*		
Donor country	*Current millions of United States dollars*	*Per cent of donor's total*	*Per cent of donor's gross national income*	*Current millions of United States dollars*	*Per cent of donor's total*	*Per cent of donor's gross national income*	*Current millions of United States dollars*	*Per cent of donor's total*	*Per cent of donor's gross national income*
Australia	177	18	0.05	687	26	0.08	765	26	0.08
Austria	113	24	0.05	253	14	0.07	280	16	0.07
Belgium	236	29	0.09	773	40	0.17	930	39	0.19
Canada	420	22	0.07	1 562	38	0.11	1 859	39	0.13
Denmark	529	32	0.31	1 075	42	0.34	1 097	39	0.32
Finland	99	26	0.08	365	37	0.15	400	34	0.15
France	1 340	22	0.09	2 958	30	0.11	3 056	28	0.11
Germany	1 188	21	0.06	3 019	25	0.09	3 628	26	0.1
Greece	8	5	0.01	110	22	0.04	144	21	0.04
Ireland	90	47	0.14	606	51	0.28	674	51	0.3
Italy	585	33	0.05	1 296	33	0.06	1 587	33	0.07
Japan	1 707	17	0.04	2 521	33	0.06	2 498	26	0.05
Luxembourg	24	23	0.14	146	39	0.36	162	39	0.38
Netherlands	810	27	0.22	1 805	29	0.23	2 028	29	0.23
New Zealand	32	22	0.06	84	26	0.07	101	29	0.09
Norway	509	39	0.33	1 322	35	0.34	1 496	38	0.33
Portugal	137	54	0.13	206	44	0.1	225	36	0.1
Spain	165	13	0.03	1 118	22	0.08	1 462	21	0.1
Sweden	481	29	0.22	1 357	31	0.29	1 543	33	0.32
Switzerland	285	31	0.1	488	29	0.11	498	24	0.1
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	923	25	0.07	4 011	41	0.14	4 199	37	0.16
United States of America	1 353	17	0.02	6 113	28	0.04	8 270	31	0.06
Total	**11 211**	**22**	**0.05**	**31 874**	**31**	**0.09**	**36 904**	**30**	**0.09**

[a] Includes imputed contributions through multilateral organizations, calculated using the geographical distribution of multilateral disbursements for the year of reference.

B. Aid for Trade donor commitments

	Commitments (current millions of United States dollars)[a]								
	2000			*2007*			*2008*		
	Bilateral	*Multilateral*	*Total*	*Bilateral*	*Multilateral*	*Total*	*Bilateral*	*Multilateral*	*Total*
Aid for Trade, least developed countries	1 667	2 205	3 872	4 357	4 999	9 356	5 590	4 943	10 533
Total official development assistance to least developed countries			15 433			36 764			46 551
Aid for Trade as percentage of official development assistance			25			25			23

Sources: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Development Assistance Committee, *Development Cooperation Report*, various years, table 31 (Paris); World Trade Organization and Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, *Aid for Trade at a Glance 2009: Maintaining Momentum* (Geneva and Paris, 2009), and updated data provided by the Development Cooperation Directorate of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development from the Creditor Reporting System online database, 26 March 2010.

[a] Aid for Trade comprises trade policy and regulation, economic infrastructure, building productive capacity and trade-related adjustment, and replaces the narrower concept of trade capacity-building in the Doha Development Agenda trade capacity-building database (see World Trade Organization and Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, *Aid for Trade at a Glance 2009: Maintaining Momentum* (Geneva and Paris, 2009)).

Table 12
Debt relief under the enhanced Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Debt Initiative (HIPC) and Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative (MDRI), and public and publicly guaranteed debt service

	Enhanced Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Debt Initiative status and debt relief						*Debt service as percentage of least developed country exports of goods, services and income abroad*		
	HIPC status 2010		*Total debt relief[a]*						
			February 2009		*February 2010*				
Least developed countries	*Pre-decision*	*Post-completion*	*HIPC*	*MDRI*	*HIPC*	*MDRI*	*2000*	*2007*	*2008*
Africa									
Angola			—	—	—	—	21	10	3
Benin		x	366	604	388	633	12	—	—
Burkina Faso		x	772	603	818	638	15	—	—
Burundi		x	908	53	964	70	39	43	28
Central African Republic	x		611	—	633	146	—	—	—
Chad	x		227	—	240	—	—	—	—
Comoros			—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Democratic Republic of the Congo	x		7 636	—	8 061	—	—	—	—
Djibouti			—	—	—	—	6	—	6
Equatorial Guinea			—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Eritrea			—	—	—	—	3	—	—
Ethiopia		x	2 575	1 458	2 726	1 512	13	4	3
Gambia		x	93	199	99	191	10	12	—
Guinea	x		761	—	807	—	20	13	10
Guinea-Bissau	x		581	—	615	—	—	—	—
Lesotho			—	—	—	—	11	7	3
Liberia	x		2 845	—	2 988	—	—	112	131
Madagascar		x	1 167	1 292	1 236	1 351	10	—	—
Malawi		x	1 310	705	1 388	733	13	—	—
Mali		x	752	1 043	797	1 097	13	—	—
Mauritania		x	868	450	920	465	—	—	—
Mozambique		x	2 992	1 057	3 169	1 107	13	1	1
Niger		x	899	519	953	542	8	—	—
Rwanda		x	908	225	963	234	24	3	—
Sao Tome and Principe		x	163	26	173	27	26	39	—
Senegal		x	682	1 374	722	1 435	14	—	—
Sierra Leone		x	857	352	906	368	67	3	—
Somalia			—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sudan			—	—	—	—	10	3	3
Togo		x	270	—	270	—	6	—	—

Least developed countries	Enhanced Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Debt Initiative status and debt relief						Debt service as percentage of least developed country exports of goods, services and income abroad		
	HIPC status 2010		Total debt relief[a]						
			February 2009		February 2010				
	Pre-decision	Post-completion	HIPC	MDRI	HIPC	MDRI	2000	2007	2008
Uganda		x	1 434	1 805	1 520	1 879	8	2	2
United Republic of Tanzania		x	2 828	2 038	2 997	2 124	13	3	1
Zambia		x	3 489	1 632	3 697	1 701	21	3	3
Asia									
Afghanistan	x		571	—	600	38[b]	—	—	—
Bangladesh			—	—	—	—	9	4	4
Bhutan			—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cambodia			—	—	—	—	2	—	1
Lao People's Democratic Republic			—	—	—	—	8	19	—
Maldives			—	—	—	—	4	5	6
Myanmar			—	—	—	—	4	—	—
Nepal			—	—	—	—	7	5	4
Timor-Leste			—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Yemen			—	—	—	—	5	3	2
Pacific									
Kiribati			—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Samoa			—	—	—	—	—	27	—
Solomon Islands			—	—	—	—	7	—	—
Tuvalu			—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Vanuatu			—	—	—	—	1	2	—
Latin America and the Caribbean									
Haiti	x		147	—	155	557		5	2
Least developed countries	**8**	**19**	**36 712**	**15 435**	**38 805**	**16 848**			

Sources: World Bank, *World Development Indicators 10* (Washington, D.C., 2010), tables 1.4 and 6.11, and World Development Indicators and Global Development Finance online (http://www.worldbank.org, accessed on 16 March 2010, with updates in progress).

[a] Data for 2009 are in net present value, millions of end-2007 dollars, and for 2010, net present value end-2008 dollars, cumulative, calculated by World Bank.

[b] Value in end-2008 net present value terms is not available.

Table 13
Selected international financial flows of the least developed countries
(Current billions of United States dollars)

	2000	*2001*	*2002*	*2003*	*2004*	*2005*	*2006*	*2007*	*2008*
Official development assistance from Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development/ Development Assistance Committee donors	12.4	12.9	15.9	22.5	23.5	26.2	30.0	32.0	36.9
United Nations system expenditures on operational activities	2.4	2.5	2.6	3.5	3.9	5.4	5.3	5.9	7.0
Debt service	11.6	12.2	9.2	8.5	8.2	7.1	6.7	6.8	7.5
Foreign direct investment	4.1	7.1	6.8	10.9	9.6	15.9	22.7	25.7	33.1
Remittances and income abroad	6.1	6.6	8.4	9.5	10.8	11.9	14.1	17.5	23.0

Sources: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Development Assistance Committee, *Development Cooperation Report*, various years, table 31 (Paris); United Nations, "Comprehensive statistical analysis of the financing of operational activities for development of the United Nations system for 2007" (A/64/75-E/2009/59) and updated data provided by the Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Development Cooperation and Policy Branch, 22 March 2010; World Bank, *World Development Indicators 10* (Washington, D.C., 2010), tables 6.1 and 6.11, and World Development Indicators and Global Development Finance online (http://www.worldbank.org, accessed on 16 March 2010, with updates in progress); United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), Foreign Direct Investment database (www.unctad.org/Template/Page.asp?intItemID=1923, accessed on 1 February 2010) and UNCTAD Central Statistics and Information Retrieval Branch.

Note: World Bank and International Monetary Fund debt relief data are only available as a cumulative total, not by year. Debt relief of the Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative by Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development/Development Assistance Committee donors is included in official development assistance.

Table 14
Annual exports and imports of merchandise in 2002, 2005 and 2008
(United States dollars at current prices and current exchange rates in millions)

Country	2002		2005		2008		Change 2002/2008 (percentage)	
	Export	Import	Export	Import	Export	Import	Export	Import
Africa								
Angola	8 328	3 760	24 105	8 353	72 179	20 982	767	458
Benin	448	729	578	1 019	1 150	1 973	157	171
Burkina Faso	245	739	468	1 260	693	2 041	183	176
Burundi	30	129	56	267	54	402	79	211
Central African Republic	147	120	129	173	150	300	2	150
Chad	185	1 500	3 144	949	4 328	1 679	2 243	12
Comoros	19	53	12	99	9	176	-52	235
Democratic Republic of the Congo	1 132	1 081	2 190	2 270	3 950	4 100	249	279
Djibouti	36	197	40	277	69	574	93	191
Equatorial Guinea	2 117	507	7 064	1 310	14 930	3 746	605	638
Eritrea	52	538	11	495	15	549	-71	2
Ethiopia	480	1 622	926	4 095	1 602	8 680	234	435
Gambia	13	160	8	237	14	329	9	106
Guinea	709	667	890	820	1 300	1 600	83	140
Guinea-Bissau	54	59	90	106	125	196	132	236
Lesotho	358	815	651	1 410	900	2 030	151	149
Liberia	176	178	131	310	242	814	38	357
Madagascar	667	627	836	1 686	1 667	3 846	150	514
Malawi	405	690	502	1 164	879	1 700	117	146
Mali	875	927	1 101	1 544	2 097	3 339	140	260
Mauritania	332	431	625	1 428	1 751	1 726	428	300
Mozambique	810	1 543	1 745	2 408	2 653	4 008	228	160
Niger	280	468	478	943	904	1 575	223	236
Rwanda	65	249	125	430	256	1 178	294	374
Sao Tome and Principe	5	31	7	50	11	114	112	267
Senegal	1 069	2 031	1 575	3 498	2 006	6 528	88	221
Sierra Leone	49	264	159	345	215	533	342	102
Somalia	297	454	251	626	456	1 131	54	149
Sudan	1 949	2 446	4 824	6 757	11 671	9 352	499	282
Togo	429	591	659	1 193	836	1 540	95	161
Uganda	478	1 074	1 016	2 054	2 704	4 526	465	321
United Republic of Tanzania	981	1 660	1 684	3 287	3 040	7 081	210	326
Zambia	956	1 103	1 810	2 558	5 099	5 061	433	359
Subtotal Africa	**24 176**	**27 443**	**57 887**	**53 419**	**137 955**	**103 407**	**471**	**277**

Country	2002		2005		2008		Change 2002/2008 (percentage)	
	Export	Import	Export	Import	Export	Import	Export	Import
Asia								
Afghanistan	100	2 452	384	2 470	540	3 020	440	23
Bangladesh	6 149	8 592	9 297	13 889	15 380	23 840	150	177
Bhutan	113	196	258	386	519	540	360	176
Cambodia	1 923	2 361	2 910	3 918	4 708	6 508	145	176
Lao People's Democratic Republic	301	447	553	882	1 085	1 405	261	214
Maldives	132	392	162	745	331	1 388	150	254
Myanmar	3 046	2 348	3 814	1 927	6 950	4 299	128	83
Nepal	603	1 379	823	2 094	944	3 581	57	160
Timor-Leste	—	—	8	112	14	353	—	—
Yemen	3 684	2 921	6 413	5 378	8 977	10 452	144	258
Subtotal Asia	**16 051**	**21 088**	**24 621**	**31 802**	**39 448**	**55 386**	**146**	**163**
Latin America and the Caribbean								
Haiti	280	1 130	470	1 454	476	2 316	70	105
Pacific								
Kiribati	3	50	4	76	15	55	341	
Samoa	72	132	87	239	72	288	1	118
Solomon Islands	58	67	105	185	211	329	265	392
Tuvalu	0	11	0	13	0	27	100	137
Vanuatu	20	90	38	149	57	313	180	247
Subtotal Pacific	**153**	**350**	**234**	**662**	**354**	**1 011**	**887**	**189**
Total least developed countries	**40 660**	**50 011**	**83 213**	**87 337**	**178 234**	**162 119**	**338**	**224**

Source: UNCTADstat Total Merchandise Trade, data accessed on 20 October 2010 at http://unctadstat.unctad.org.

Table 15
Annual exports and imports of services in 2002, 2005 and 2008
(United States dollars at current prices and current exchange rates in millions)

Least developed countries	*2002*		*2005*		*2008*		*Change 2002/2008 (percentage)*	
	Export	*Import*	*Export*	*Import*	*Export*	*Import*	*Export*	*Import*
Africa								
Angola	207	3 322	177	6 791	330	22 139	59	566
Benin	152	209	194	279	—	—	27•	34•
Burkina Faso	59	163	68	360	107	565	80	246
Burundi	8	43	35	134	66	191	783	348
Central African Republic	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Chad	67	671	126	1 522	195	2 409	190	259
Comoros	23	24	45	45	66	77	184	217
Democratic Republic of the Congo	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Djibouti	192	62	248	84	295	128	53	107
Equatorial Guinea	25	615	71	1 518	—	—	180•	147•
Eritrea	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ethiopia	585	580	1 012	1 194	1 959	2 410	235	315
Gambia	73	56	80	45	123	88	68	58
Guinea	91	331	83	272	61	342	-33	3
Guinea-Bissau	7	28	5	42	—	—	-18•	52•
Lesotho	35	55	52	103	67	110	93	98
Liberia	—	—	213	856	379	1 389	78••	62••
Madagascar	397	704	498	615	854	1 470	115	109
Malawi	49	222	54	280	73	379	48	71
Mali	169	387	274	588	454	1 024	168	165
Mauritania	74	220	80	379	93	645	25	194
Mozambique	339	577	342	649	555	965	64	67
Niger	51	152	88	279	—	—	73•	83•
Rwanda	55	202	129	304	408	522	639	159
Sao Tome and Principe	9	12	9	11	10	21	13	75
Senegal	456	474	777	806	—	—	70•	70•
Sierra Leone	38	81	78	91	61	125	60	55
Somalia	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sudan	132	818	114	1 844	493	2 620	273	220
Togo	90	148	177	251	283	359	215	143
Uganda	225	530	502	609	733	1 256	226	137
United Republic of Tanzania	920	633	1 269	1 207	2 169	1 598	136	153
Zambia	115	375	273	471	297	911	158	143
Subtotal Africa	**4 644**	**11 692**	**7 073**	**21 629**	**10 131**	**41 745**	**118**	**257**
Asia								
Afghanistan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bangladesh	849	1 406	1 249	2 207	1 996	3 664	135	161
Bhutan	23	60	43	128	55	161	143	169
Cambodia	604	376	1 118	643	1 645	1 036	172	176
Lao People's Democratic Republic	176	32	204	56	303	105	72	224

Least developed countries	2002		2005		2008		Change 2002/2008 (percentage)	
	Export	Import	Export	Import	Export	Import	Export	Import
Maldives	363	111	323	213	704	348	94	214
Myanmar	426	310	259	502	263	1 157	-38	274
Nepal	305	237	380	435	724	852	137	260
Timor-Leste	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Yemen	166	935	372	1 242	1 205	2 348	625	151
Subtotal Asia	**2 912**	**3 466**	**3 948**	**5 425**	**6 894**	**9 670**	**137**	**179**
Latin America and the Caribbean								
Haiti	147	270	146	544	343	746	134	177
Pacific								
Kiribati	9	21	10	38	13	37	43	76
Samoa	—	—	114	56	154	56	36**	0**
Solomon Islands	16	49	41	58	59	116	269	138
Tuvalu	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Vanuatu	94	52	139	74	223	96	138	85
Subtotal Pacific	**119**	**121**	**303**	**226**	**449**	**304**	**279**	**151**
Total least developed countries	**7 822**	**15 548**	**11 470**	**27 824**	**17 817**	**52 465**	**128**	**237**

Source: UNCTADstat Trade in Services. Data accessed on 20 October 2010 at http://unctadstat.unctad.org.

* The percentage change in exports and imports is from 2002 to 2005.

** The percentage change in exports and imports is from 2005 to 2008.

Table 16
Women in Parliament: percentage of parliamentary seats in the single or lower chamber occupied by women (as at June 2010)

Least developed countries	*1995*	*2000*	*2005*	*2007*	*2008*	*2009*	*2010*
Africa							
Angola	10	16	15	15	15	37	39
Benin	8	6	7	8	11	11	11
Burkina Faso	4	8	12	12	15	15	15
Burundi	—	14	31	31	31	31	31
Central African Republic	4	7	—	11	11	11	10
Chad	16	2	7	7	5	5	5
Comoros	0	—	3	3	3	3	3
Democratic Republic of the Congo	5	—	12	8	8	8	8
Djibouti	0	0	11	11	14	14	14
Equatorial Guinea	8	5	18	18	6	10	10
Eritrea	21	15	22	22	22	22	22
Ethiopia	5	—	—	22	22	22	—
Gambia	—	2	13	9	9	9	8
Guinea	7	9	19	19	19	—	0
Guinea-Bissau	10	8	14	14	14	10	10
Lesotho	5	4	12	24	25	24	24
Liberia	6	8	5	13	13	13	13
Madagascar	4	8	7	7	8	—	0
Malawi	6	8	14	14	13	21	21
Mali	2	12	10	10	10	10	10
Mauritania	0	4	4	18	22	22	22
Mozambique	25	30	35	35	35	35	39
Niger	4	1	12	12	12	10	0
Rwanda	17	17	49	49	49	56	56
Sao Tome and Principe	7	9	9	7	2	7	7
Senegal	12	12	19	22	22	22	23
Sierra Leone	—	9	15	15	13	13	13
Somalia	—	—	8	8	8	6	7
Sudan	8	—	10	18	18	18	—
Togo	1	5	7	9	11	11	11
Uganda	17	18	24	30	31	31	32
United Republic of Tanzania	11	16	21	30	30	30	31
Zambia	7	10	13	15	15	15	14
Average Africa	**8**	**9**	**15**	**17**	**16**	**18**	**16**

Least developed countries	*1995*	*2000*	*2005*	*2007*	*2008*	*2009*	*2010*
Asia							
Afghanistan	—	—	—	27	28	28	27
Bangladesh	11	9	2	15	—	19	19
Bhutan	0	2	9	3	9	9	9
Cambodia	6	7	10	10	10	21	21
Lao People's Democratic Republic	9	21	23	25	25	25	25
Maldives	6	6	12	12	12	7	7
Nepal	—	6	6	17	33	33	33
Timor-Leste	—	—	25	28	29	29	29
Yemen	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Average Asia	**6**	**7**	**11**	**15**	**18**	**19**	**19**
Latin America and the Caribbean							
Haiti	—	—	4	4	4	4	4
Pacific							
Kiribati	0	5	5	7	4	4	4
Samoa	4	8	6	6	8	8	8
Solomon Islands	2	2	0	0	0	0	0
Tuvalu	—	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vanuatu	2	0	4	4	4	4	4
Average Pacific	**2**	**3**	**3**	**3**	**3**	**3**	**3**
Average least developed countries	**7**	**8**	**13**	**15**	**15**	**16**	**15**

Source: Inter-Parliamentary Union, Women in national parliaments, situation as of 31 May 2010; available from Inter-Parliamentary Union website, http://www.ipu.org/wmn-e/classif-arc.htm (accessed in June 2010); data online at http://unstats.un.org/unsd/demographic/products/indwm/tab6a.htm.

Table 17
Worldwide Governance Indicators (percentile ranks in the world)

Country	*Voice and accountability*		*Political stability*		*Government effectiveness*		*Regulatory quality*		*Rule of law*		*Control of corruption*	
	2000	*2009*	*2000*	*2009*	*2000*	*2009*	*2000*	*2009*	*2000*	*2009*	*2000*	*2009*
Africa												
Angola	8	15	1	36	5	20	5	17	2	12	3	5
Benin	60	57	69	62	46	38	41	40	45	29	32	31
Burkina Faso	39	41	48	40	31	32	46	49	40	33	55	40
Burundi	3	28	2	10	3	13	11	11	5	12	8	11
Central African Republic	28	21	12	3	5	5	16	12	4	7	6	22
Chad	21	10	14	6	25	4	19	12	21	3	22	4
Comoros	18	39	39	16	7	1	9	5	9	15	9	25
Djibouti	29	16	30	63	11	21	21	29	28	31	20	50
Democratic Republic of the Congo	2	9	1	3	2	2	2	4	1	2	2	3
Equatorial Guinea	6	3	41	43	4	3	6	7	10	8	3	1
Eritrea	10	1	14	20	12	6	16	2	39	9	75	46
Ethiopia	19	12	13	6	15	41	13	18	25	23	40	27
Gambia	17	17	61	54	35	31	40	42	49	41	43	35
Guinea	15	9	6	5	17	8	27	11	7	2	27	7
Guinea-Bissau	27	28	21	29	12	14	12	10	6	4	19	10
Lesotho	35	45	45	57	52	46	36	30	51	47	50	62
Liberia	14	38	3	17	2	11	5	10	1	14	2	34
Madagascar	52	30	52	24	32	33	32	35	44	26	55	51
Malawi	44	42	27	43	44	37	42	32	36	49	51	39
Mali	48	54	51	35	21	24	49	36	36	42	30	29
Mauritania	23	20	51	14	51	21	35	27	44	21	49	31
Mozambique	45	47	46	64	42	44	44	42	29	34	38	41
Niger	46	29	40	14	11	25	27	34	22	32	14	31
Rwanda	7	11	5	34	23	49	14	41	9	36	28	62
Sao Tome and Principe	59	55	80	53	38	30	19	25	49	27	56	42
Senegal	53	38	29	39	54	41	48	45	55	46	54	36
Sierra Leone	7	41	3	32	4	10	8	24	7	18	18	16

Country	Voice and accountability		Political stability		Government effectiveness		Regulatory quality		Rule of law		Control of corruption	
	2000	2009	2000	2009	2000	2009	2000	2009	2000	2009	2000	2009
Somalia	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1
Sudan	6	6	2	1	9	7	10	9	4	5	16	6
Togo	14	19	39	38	10	6	25	22	30	20	30	14
Uganda	18	33	8	15	39	34	53	47	26	41	12	21
United Republic of Tanzania	37	44	29	48	40	39	42	38	42	40	11	41
Zambia	33	40	32	64	16	30	42	36	34	38	21	37
Latin America and the Caribbean												
Haiti	24	30	19	21	6	5	15	23	3	6	4	11
Asia												
Afghanistan	1	10	1	1	1	3	1	3	1	1	1	1
Bangladesh	36	35	28	8	33	17	23	23	27	28	14	17
Bhutan	20	29	61	71	78	65	35	14	58	59	72	78
Cambodia	25	23	22	25	19	26	43	39	21	16	23	9
Lao People's Democratic Republic	14	5	23	44	21	15	7	14	22	18	26	10
Maldives	27	44	39	86	65	42	74	37	60	53	52	30
Myanmar	1	1	9	7	8	1	4	1	10	4	5	0
Nepal	43	31	15	5	37	18	28	24	42	18	39	25
Timor-Leste	51	51	57	29	99	11	—	11	—	9	—	16
Yemen	21	12	11	2	22	11	25	30	8	13	21	15
Pacific												
Kiribati	81	69	98	97	50	27	14	8	63	60	48	55
Samoa	70	65	89	87	66	56	53	45	72	68	56	61
Solomon Islands	56	56	19	56	13	16	8	8	2	29	20	44
Tuvalu	92	71	99	97	69	40	63	15	95	83	60	53
Vanuatu	64	68	83	93	33	45	33	25	46	63	26	69

Source: http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/sc_country.asp.

Note: The Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI) project reports aggregate and individual governance indicators for 213 economies over the period 1996-2009, for six dimensions of governance. The aggregate indicators combine the views of a large number of enterprise, citizen and expert survey respondents in industrial and developing countries. The individual data sources underlying the aggregate indicators are drawn from a diverse variety of survey institutes, think tanks, non-governmental organizations, and international organizations.

11-22699

A/66/66
E/2011/78

Table 18
Participation of least developed countries in Group of Eight and Group of Twenty meetings

Year	*Least developed countries participation at Group of Eight summits (capacity)*	*Least developed countries participation at Group of Twenty summits (capacity)*
2000	Senegal	
2001	Angola	
	Bangladesh	
	Ethiopia (Chair of NEPAD)	
	Mali	
2002		
2003	Senegal	
2004	Senegal	
	Uganda	
	Yemen	
2005	Ethiopia (Chair of NEPAD)	
	Senegal	
	Tanzania	
2006	Democratic Republic of the Congo (Chair of the African Union)	
2007	Ethiopia (Chair of NEPAD)	
	Senegal	
2008	Ethiopia (Chair of NEPAD)	
	Senegal	
	Tanzania	
2009	Angola	Ethiopia (Chair of NEPAD)
	Ethiopia (Chair of NEPAD)	
	Senegal	
2010	Ethiopia (Chair of NEPAD)	Ethiopia (Chair of NEPAD) Toronto Summit
	Haiti	Malawi (Chair of the African Union) Toronto Summit
	Malawi (Chair of the African Union)	Ethiopia (Chair of NEPAD) Seoul Summit
		Malawi (Chair of the African Union) Seoul Summit

Sources: www.g20.utoronto.ca/; http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/; www.g20.org.
Abbreviation: NEPAD, New Partnership for Africa's Development.

Table 19
Least developed countries versus low income countries

Least developed countries (year of inclusion in the least developed country list, if any)	*Low income countries (per capita gross national income <$995 in 2009)*
Africa	
Angola (1994)*	
Benin (1971)	Benin
Burkina Faso (1971)	Burkina Faso
Burundi (1971)	Burundi
Central African Republic (1975)	Central African Republic
Chad (1971)	Chad
Comoros (1977)	Comoros
Democratic Republic of the Congo (1991)	Democratic Republic of the Congo
Djibouti (1982)*	
Equatorial Guinea (1982)*	
Eritrea (1994)	Eritrea
Ethiopia (1971)	Ethiopia
Gambia (1975)	Gambia
	Ghana
Guinea (1971)	Guinea
Guinea-Bissau (1981)	Guinea-Bissau
	Kenya**
Lesotho (1971)*	
Liberia (1990)	Liberia
Madagascar (1991)	Madagascar
Malawi (1971)	Malawi
Mali (1971)	Mali
Mauritania (1986)	Mauritania
Mozambique (1988)	Mozambique
Niger (1971)	Niger
Rwanda (1971)	Rwanda
Sao Tome and Principe (1982)*	
Senegal (2000)*	
Sierra Leone (1982)	Sierra Leone
Somalia (1971)	Somalia
Sudan (1971)*	
Togo (1982)	Togo
Uganda (1971)	Uganda
United Republic of Tanzania (1971)	United Republic of Tanzania
Zambia (1991)	Zambia
	Zimbabwe**

Least developed countries (year of inclusion in the least developed country category)	*Low income countries (per capita gross national income <$995 in 2009)*
Asia	
Afghanistan (1971)	Afghanistan
Bangladesh (1975)	Bangladesh
Bhutan (1971)*	
Cambodia (1991)	Cambodia
	Korea, Democratic Republic**
	Kyrgyz Republic**
Lao People's Democratic Republic (1971)	Lao People's Democratic Republic
Maldives (1971)*	
Myanmar (1987)	Myanmar
Nepal (1971)	Nepal
	Tajikistan**
Timor-Leste (2003)*	
Yemen (1971)*	
Latin America and the Caribbean	
Haiti (1971)	Haiti
Pacific	
Kiribati (1986)*	
Samoa (1971)*	
Solomon Islands (1991)	Solomon Islands
Tuvalu (1986)*	
Vanuatu (1985)*	

Sources: http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/cdp/ldc/ldc_list.pdf.

* Least developed countries that are not classified as low income countries.

** Low income countries not included in the least developed countries category.

Remarks on evaluation methodology

In principle, evaluating the implementation of the Brussels Programme of Action requires assessing whether actions have been actually undertaken. However, in many cases this is impossible as actions are often not really "actionable". They stipulate that the parties will "promote" (usually least developed countries) or "support" (development partners) certain actions or approaches. Actions are sometimes formulated like objectives. Some actions are rather general and not well defined. Moreover, the number of actions is very large: 156 for least developed countries and 178 for development partners.

The national reports of least developed countries indicate that the countries have taken measures to implement most of the actions assigned to them by the Brussels Programme of Action. Actions may have been prompted by the Programme of Action or by commitments at different forums (some of which are legally binding: e.g., World Trade Organization agreements or regional arrangements).[11] Pressure from international institutions, e.g., under poverty reduction strategy papers, or donor preferences may also be the determinants of policies or actions, which are nevertheless in line with Brussels Programme of Action commitments.

Various programmes covering similar areas and proposing similar policies and actions as the Brussels Programme of Action, but which are not least developed country-specific, have been designed at different forums. Their implementation has helped achieve Brussels Programme of Action goals, even if the Programme of Action cannot be identified as the sole source of success. Evaluation of a programme of action would be easier if overlapping between objectives, goals and actions were avoided and whoever is responsible for implementation were identified. A distinction between general development challenges and specific least developed country challenges, particularly those relating to the inclusion criteria for least developed country status, would also be useful in evaluation.

A quantitative analysis of implementation can only be very partial. The Brussels Programme of Action has 30 explicit numerically specific goals, of which two thirds are derived from the Millennium Development Goals. For a list of these goals, see annex I to the report of the Secretary-General, entitled "Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2001-2010" (A/61/82-E/2006/74). For several objectives and commitments no explicit targets have been set. Data are often unavailable or inconsistent. Moreover, much of the critical goals and actions of the Brussels Programme of Action are stated in qualitative terms.

[11] Economic Commission for Africa and Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, *The Mutual Review of Development Effectiveness in Africa: Promise and Performance*, 2010 (Economic Commission for Africa and OECD, 2010) refers to at least 20 initiatives of global scope and at least 10 regional ones on specific issues covered by the Brussels Programme of Action.